The University of Chicago

ACQUAINTANCE WITH OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURES

By
GUSTAVE OTTO ARLT

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41546811_0031

The University of Chicago

ACQUAINTANCE WITH OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

By
GUSTAVE OTTO ARLT

THE JOURNAL AND REVIEW PRESS
CRAWFORDSVILLE, INDIANA
1931

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CONTENTS

Chapter I

POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS 7

Chapter II

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH IN OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE 16

I. General Treatment of Older Literature .. 20
- a) *Biographical* 20
- b) *Bibliographical* 22
- c) *Historico-critical* 26

II. Oldest Literature 30
- a) *Gothic and Scandinavian* 30
- b) *Old High German* 31
- c) *Linguistic Studies* 32
- d) *Historical Studies* 33

III. Middle High German Poetry 34

IV. Meistergesang, Fable, Drama 36

V. Theological Literature and Humanism 39

VI. The Seventeenth Century 41

Chapter III

POPULAR INTEREST IN OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE AFTER 1740 44

I. The Volksbuch 46

II. M. H. G. Epics, Romances and Other Poems .. 51

III. Spiritual and Theological Literature 61

IV. Meistergesang, Fable and Satiric Writing ... 66

V. The Seventeenth Century 72

TO MY FATHER

CHAPTER I: POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS

"In den Jahren 1805 und 1806 lag unser liebes Vaterland tief darnieder; man sah das Elend ein und klagte, jammerte—aber abhelfen, das konnte Niemand. Die edlen Geister Deutschlands suchten das Traurige der Lage etwas zu lindern: sie griffen zurück in jene schöne altdeutsche Zeit, in die Zeit des Heldenmuts, des Sanges und der schönen kräftigen Sprache. Das sollte Kraft und Trost verleihen! Das sollte das Vaterland wieder aufrichten helfen! Mit der Poesie der letzten fünfzig Jahre liesz sich nichts machen: nur eine Poesie des Patriotismus konnte zweckdienlich sein. Man fing das Mittelalter zu bewundern an, studierte seine Sprache und die in ihr abgefasste goldene Dichtung. In Berlin und Heidelberg regte sich's allenthalben. Die Schlegel und Tieck, Josef Görres, Clemens Brentano, von der Hagen, Docen (München), Arnim, Meusebach, Büsching, die Grimm und Uhland—sind es, die uns bald in volkstümlicher, auf die Massen einwirkender Weise, bald in wissenschaftlicher Art unsere altdeutschen Gold- und Silberkammern erschlossen. Wilhelm Schlegel und v. d. Hagen berichteten und lasen über das Nibelungenlied; letzterer veröffentlichte a. 1807 dasselbe und kam mit dieser Erneuung Tieck zuvor, dessen Minnelieder daneben vorläufig noch die altdeutsche Lektüre ausmachten. Die Volksbücher, 'gedruckt in diesem Jahre', das deutsche Stoffe bietende Puppentheater waren die Lieblingsunterhaltungen der Berliner gebildeten Welt. Schlag auf Schlag folgten Bücher altdeutscher Poesie, altdeutscher Sitte aus v. d. Hagens Feder; a. 1810 konnte schon sein Nibelungenlied im Urtexte in die Welt hinausziehen. Jetzt kam Heinrich von Kleist mit seinem 'Käthchen von Heilbronn', ja noch weiter hinauf griff er (1808) mit seinem 'Armin, dem Cherusker'; Fouqué dichtete

mittelalterliche Romane und Trauerspiele. Neben Berlin war Heidelberg der Sammelpunkt der begeisterten deutschen Männer."[1])

This quotation expresses in an eloquent flow of language one of the most prevalent conceptions of the merits of Romanticists—and that of the Romanticists in the most limited sense of the term. No matter what differences of opinion may arise regarding the philosophical and aesthetic principles of the Romantic School, there is almost perfect agreement on this point that the Romanticists are responsible for the revival of interest in the language and literature of the older periods of German history. In the depths of nationalistic depression after the disastrous days of Jena and Austerlitz—so runs this literary tradition—the craving for patriotic expression sought an outlet through the accounts of the heroes of a distant but glorious past, of valorous deeds that time had buried but never dimmed. In this newly discovered Lethean stream that flowed in long-forgotten channels from the Middle Ages the Romanticists found surcease from the ignominy of political reality.

That the view expressed by Birlinger and Crecelius has by no means been changed by later scholarship is clearly shown by the following statements of quite recent origin. "Anderen hebben tegelijkertijd, te Heidelberg en elders, den jammer van het verbrokkeld en vernedert Duitschland in de schriften der roemrijke Middeleeuwen trachten te vergeten."[2]) The fifty-odd years that have elapsed since the new edition of *Des Knaben Wunderhorn* have not brought this writer a step beyond Birlinger and Crecelius. Gottfried Salomon sees in this new-found

---

1) *Des Knaben Wunderhorn.* Neu bearbeitet von Anton Birlinger und Wilhelm Crecelius (Wiesbaden 1874) I, I.

2) F. H. Fischer, *De Romantiek in Duitschland* (Amsterdam 1928), p. 114-115.

interest in the Germanic past the chief difference between Classicism and Romanticism: "Indem der Klassizismus die vergangene Kultur eines fremden Volkes aufstellte, stand er im Gegensatz zur deutschen Romantik, die auf die eigene Kulturvergangenheit zurückgriff, um die Tradition zu erneuern und fortzuführen."[3]

Expressed in somewhat more cautious terms we find the same idea uttered by Karl Borinski: "Die Welt des Mittelalters, für welche die Romane der Chevalerie ja den Namen 'romantisch' in erster Linie in Anspruch nahmen, löste diejenige der Griechheit immer mehr ab. Und hier ist es, wo die Romantik ihre eigentümlichen Verdienste hat in der Erweckung eines nachhaltigen, thätigen Interesses für die lange vernachlässigten Zeiten, denen schon Goethe und Herder das Ekelwort 'gotisch' als 'barbarisch' abzunehmen gesucht hat."[4] This writer sees the transition from Classicism to Romanticism as a deliberate process for which he does not supply a motive. But he, likewise, is certain that the credit for the reawakening of interest in these "long-neglected" (lange vernachlässigten) times is due the Romanticists.

Many investigators have gone even a step farther in their efforts to attribute the revival of interest in the Middle Ages to the Romanticists by assigning the lion's share of credit to an individual writer. This fortunate person is Ludwig Tieck. Birlinger and Crecelius, it has been noted, name A. W. Schlegel and Tieck at the outset and then make special mention of the fact that von der Hagen's *Nibelungenlied* anticipated Tieck, thereby tacitly acknowledging that the latter is popularly regarded as the leader in this movement. R. M. Wernaer is more out-

3) Gottfried Salomon, *Das Mittelalter als Ideal in der Romantik* (München 1922), p. 11.

4) Karl Borinski, "Geschichte der deutschen Litteratur seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters" (*Deutsche National Litteratur*, 163, II), p. 347.

spoken in the following passage: "Dusty books and documents long forgotten were reopened, and were searched with eagerness for evidences of their Northern spirit. What did our forefathers write? Perhaps they produced a greater literature than we have commonly supposed. If so, let us bring it to light....Tieck resuscitated in his writings the sleeping spirit of former times, breathed his own soul into it, and gave it to the world in the form of new romantic tales and dramas."[5]

Hermann Petrich concedes to Ludwig Tieck the glory of having pointed the way to the Middle Ages although he magnanimously permits Wackenroder to share this glory with him: "Tieck giebt hierzu (Bekanntschaft mit unserer älteren Dichtung), wie zu allen eigentlich dichterischen Neuerungen der Schule, den Ton an.... Die erste bestimmte Anregung aber, seine Aufmerksamkeit der älteren germanischen Dichtung zuzuwenden empfing Tieck, wie so vieles, von seinem Busenfreunde Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder....Ein zärtlicher Briefwechsel verband die Getrennten. In ihm springt die Quelle der romantischen Germanistik."[6] The final sentence of the quotation is particularly replete with meaning. The term "romantische Germanistik" undoubtedly applies not only to scholarly research in the realm of older German language and literature by such representative Romantic Germanists as the Grimms, Docen, Büsching and von der Hagen but also to the more popular literary endeavors of such representative Romantic authors as Fouqué, Kleist, Hölderlin and Eichendorff. The implication in Petrich's statement is clearly this, that neither scholarly research nor literary revival or imitation of older German writing existed before Romanticism

5) Robert M. Wernaer, *Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany* (New York and London 1910), p. 307.

6) Hermann Petrich, *Drei Kapitel vom romantischen Stil* (Leipzig 1878), p. 44-45.

and that both are due directly to the joint efforts of Tieck and Wackenroder.

The naive reader of these works on the literary and scholarly activities of the Romanticists is particularly struck by the fact that the various writers insist upon giving the impression that this interest in older German literature is an entirely new and unprecedented characteristic of this period. "Sie griffen zurück in die altdeutsche Zeit....Man fing das Mittelalter zu bewundern an" (Birlinger and Crecelius). "Sie griffen zurück auf die eigene Kulturvergangenheit, um die Tradition zu erneuern" (Salomon). "Die Erweckung eines Interesses" (Borinski). "Let us bring it to light....Tieck resuscitated the spirit of the former times" (Wernaer). Surely a tradition can be renewed only if it has been interrupted; a spirit can be resuscitated only if it is quite dead. And that, indeed, is the import which these writers seek to convey. Such expressions as "die lange vernachlässigten Zeiten" (Borinski), "dusty books and documents long forgotten," "the sleeping spirit of former times" (Wernaer) are clearly intended to give the impression not only that interest in the older periods of German literature was quite dead, but also that there was neither scholarly knowledge nor popular consciousness of the products of these periods.

It is interesting, though not necessarily profitable, to trace this current impression through the great bulk of literature dealing with the Romantic period. The excerpts quoted above give a fair cross-section of the verdict of the past fifty years. If we go back to the earliest writings that look upon Romanticism in retrospect we find the same opinion; in fact, it is present in the first literary historical work that deals with this period, expressed by no less an authority than Heinrich Heine. "Was war aber die romantische Schule in Deutschland?" he asks and finds the answer: "Sie war nichts anders als

die Wiedererweckung der Poesie des Mittelalters, wie sie sich in dessen Liedern, Bild- und Bauwerken, in Kunst und Leben manifestirt hatte."[7] This statement contains both the elements of truth and of falsehood that have found perpetuation through a century of literary-historical writings.

It is undoubtedly true that the beginning of the nineteenth century witnessed a tremendous increase in interest, both scholarly and popular, in the life and literature of the Middle Ages. Whether this increase in interest was brought about by Romanticism or whether Romantic philosophy and ideals were shaped by the growing sympathy and understanding for the older literature is a question with which we do not concern ourselves. It is likewise true, however, that the nineteenth century is inseparably linked to the older periods of German literature by two powerful chains: one, the continued, unflagging scholarly interest that kept alive for a limited group, at least, the cultural achievements of the past; the other, a practically unbroken stream of literary tradition that preserved for the reading public a large bulk of the products of earlier centuries. It cannot be disputed, of course, that many valuable older works were temporarily lost to the mass of readers of the eighteenth century before the time of wholesale republication in the Romantic period. But it is entirely erroneous to suppose that the average reader of the latter half of the eighteenth century lived in utter ignorance of all literature before 1750 or even before 1700. It is equally erroneous to assume that the scholarship of the eighteenth century lagged far behind that of the early nineteenth. We are so accustomed to thinking of Germanistics in terms of Grimm, Büsching, von der Hagen, Lachmann and Mone that we are likely to forget about Gottsched, Bodmer,

7) Heinrich Heine, *Die romantische Schule* (Hamburg 1836), p. 7.

Schilter, Scherz and Oberlin. The nineteenth century did not witness the laying of the corner-stone of the edifice of Germanic philology and the Grimms were merely carrying forward the work of Gottsched and of Opitz and of Luther and of many patient and obscure scholars of earlier centuries.

The aim of the following chapters is two-fold: first, to render an account of eighteenth century scholarship, insofar as it dealt with older Germanic literature; second, to trace, as accurately as possible, the popular, literary interest in the older writers and monuments, as it manifests itself in republications and imitations of such works and in allusions to them. The attainment of the latter objective presents much greater difficulties than the former. In the first place, the line of demarcation between literary and scholarly endeavor is not always clearly defined. It is reasonable, of course, to regard an edition of the *Hildebrandslied*, for example, with glossary and notes as a piece of scholarly research. It is more difficult, however, to define the character of such works as von der Hagen's translation of the *Nibelungenlied*. In many cases the antiquarian and aesthetic interests are so closely interrelated as to seem practically inseparable. There can be no doubt, for instance, that Gottsched's interest in older literature was primarily philological. Nevertheless there are occasional evidences that he was not entirely insensible to the aesthetic side of the monuments with which he worked. "Im allgemeinen steht Gottsched der älteren Literatur als gelehrter Polyhistor gegenüber, nur dass allerdings ein gewisser patriotischer Eifer mit im Spiele ist, der zeigen will, dass Deutschland doch auch in der früheren Zeit einiges hervorgebracht hat. Dazu kommt, dass er viel zur Popularisierung der altdeutschen Studien beigetragen hat, indem seine kleineren Arbeiten auf diesem Gebiete deutsch geschrieben

und in seinen Zeitschriften veröffentlicht sind, die sich an weitere Kreise wendeten."[8] Another difficulty, but one which is more easily solved, is the fact that some works of purely antiquarian intent have given rise to literary revivals. "Es kann ihm (Gottsched) nicht einfallen aus der älteren Zeit Anregung für die Gegenwart zu schöpfen. Vermittelt hat er allerdings solche Anregung, ohne es zu wollen, durch seine Ausgabe des *Reineke Vos* mit prosaischer Übersetzung (1752), auf der Goethes Bearbeitung beruht."[9]

For practical purposes the line of demarcation between scholarly and literary endeavor must be somewhat arbitrarily drawn according to the apparent purpose of the writer. It is fairly evident, as suggested above, that Gottsched's interest was primarily philological. Similarly there is good reason to assume that Bodmer was attracted by aesthetic considerations. "Ganz anders verhält es sich mit Gottscheds Gegnern, Bodmer und Breitinger. Sie sind es, bei denen zuerst als treibendes Motiv für die Beschäftigung mit der älteren Literatur an Stelle des antiquarischen Interesses das ästhetische tritt."[10] It appears proper, therefore, to place Gottsched's editions of older monuments in the category of scholarly works and Bodmer's among literary or popular revivals. This same standard must be applied to all publications falling under consideration. In some cases the deciding factor will be the known character of the editor, in others the medium of publication (learned journal or popular periodical), the audience to which the book is addressed or the manner of public acceptance.

A second difficulty clouds the question of popular, literary interest. Actual revivals of older monuments

8) Paul, *Grundriss* 2I, 43.
9) *Ibid.*
10) *Ibid.*, p. 44.

are, of course, instantly recognizable. Allusions to older literature also announce themselves at once; if we find, for example, half a dozen popular periodicals named "Eulenspiegel," we may assume that the character was a familiar one both to the publisher and to his audience. Imitations of older writings, on the other hand, can be definitely recognized only if the author furnishes us with a means of recognition. When Gleim issues a collection of verses under the title *Gedichte nach den Minnesingern* he acknowledges his indebtedness and at the same time informs us of the status of literary education of his public. If he had omitted the qualifying words in the title, we might suspect the source of his poems, we might even prove it, but we could never have the assurance that his public knew anything about their origin. In order to show the extent of actual popular interest in older literature it will therefore be necessary to limit the discussion of imitations to products that are distinctly so labeled.

CHAPTER II: SCHOLARLY RESEARCH IN OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE

A discussion of Germanistic research in the eighteenth century must necessarily begin with the great work that stands on the very threshold of the century: Johannes Schilter's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Teutonicarum.* This vast compendium represents most fairly both the extent and the quality of scholarship of this period. Johannes Schilter, born in 1632 at Pegau in Saxony, died in 1705 as counsellor-at-law and professor in Strassburg, found time to edit a large number of older German monuments and to produce a dictionary of Old High German. Only a small portion of his writings appeared in print during his lifetime. It was due to the efforts of Schilter's brilliant pupil, Johann Georg Scherz (1676-1754), that these unpublished works were collected, carefully revised, augmented by several other scholars and finally printed under the general supervision of Johann Frick at Ulm in 1727-1728.

The voluminous introduction by the final editor is most interesting in the light it casts upon his acquaintance with earlier scholarship. It is not surprising, of course, to find that he is familiar with the scholars of the generation just preceding him. Of these he names Daniel Morhof (1639-1691), Peter Lambeck (1628-1680), Justus Georg Schottelius (1612-1676), Marcus Boxhorn (1602-1653) and many others. It is not even suprising that he knows all about Martin Opitz (1597-1639) and Melchior Goldast (1578-1635). But he also shows an unexpected familiarity with the scholars of the sixteenth century: Joachim Vadianus (1484-1551), Beatus Rhenanus (1485-1547), Mathias Flacius (1520-1575), Achilles Gasser (1505-1577), Marquard Freher (1565-

1614) and Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) are all perfectly well-known names to him. Nor is his knowledge limited by the boundaries of his native country; he lists French, English, Dutch and Scandinavian scholars who have contributed to the study of ancient Germanic languages and literatures. Such universality of knowledge and catholicity of interest is most unexpected at a time when scholarship was, according to general opinion, at least dormant.

The first of the three large folio volumes contains six Old High German monuments, one Anglo-Saxon and one composite. They are Otfrid's *Krist*, Notker's *Psalmen*, Williram's *Hohes Lied*, OHG *Isidor (de nativitate)*, *Benediktinerregel* and the *Annolied;* also the Anglo-Saxon *Gospel Index*, a number of minor OHG, MHG and OE catechetical monuments and finally a MHG church calendar. The work of editing is done in a thoroughly scholarly manner. The texts, to be sure, especially of Otfrid, are faulty, for the editors did not have access to a sufficient number of manuscripts, but the apparatus is good and variant readings are not incorporated as emendations but are noted at the foot of the page.

The second volume is chiefly devoted to Middle High German literature. We find here the younger *Salic Law*, the *Schwabenspiegel*, Pfaffe Conrad's *Rolandslied*, Stricker's *Karl, König Tyrol, der Winsbeke* and *die Winsbekin*. In addition there are three very important Old High German monuments: the *Ludwigslied*, *Tatian* and *Christus und die Samariterin*.

For the compilation of the glossary, which occupies the entire third volume, the author used not only the texts of the first two volumes but lists as sources the following authors and monuments: *Monseer Fragmente*, Geiler von Kaisersberg, *der welsche Gast*, Caedmon, the *Alexanderlied*, both *Eddas*, the *Heldenbuch* (edition of 1590), *Pfaffe*

Amis, Melusine, the *Narrenschiff* (both Brant's original and Geiler's sermons), Rixner's *Turnierbuch* and *der Trojanische Krieg* (edition of 1489). Moreover the glossary has copious references to Flacius' and Lambeck's editions of Otfrid, to the Gothic Bible, to Ælfric's glosses, to a number of Minnesingers and other writers and monuments.

To complete the picture of Germanic scholarship at the beginning of the eighteenth century, a little light must be thrown upon some of the learned contemporaries of Schilter and Scherz. Foremost among these is Johann Georg Eccard (1674-1730), disciple of Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1710). His first two works, *De usu et praestantia studii etymologici in historia* (Helmstädt 1706) and *Historia studii etymologici linguae Germanicae hactenus impensi* (Hannover 1711) clearly show the direction of his interest. In 1713 he edited the socalled *Weissenburg Catechism* under the title *Incerti Monachi Weissenburgensis Catechesis Theotisca* and in 1720 the Latin-German poem on the reconciliation of Otto the Great with his brother Henry. His greatest work, published after his death, is the *Commentarii de rebus Franciae orientalis;* it contains the *Hildebrandslied* and several important collections of Old High German glosses.

Diederich von Stade (1637-1718) shared the contemporary interest in Otfrid and published portions of the *Evangelienbuch* in 1706. His friend and associate, Johann Philipp Palthen (1672-1710), turned his attention to other OHG monuments and published in 1706 an edition of *Tatian* and the translation of Isidor's *Contra Iudaeos*. A little earlier Peter Lambeck (1628-1680) had opened the treasures of the Imperial Library at Vienna by means of his *Commentarii de Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensi* in which he calls attention to the manuscripts of Otfrid, Notker's *Psalms* and other monuments that had so far

been overlooked. Johann Diecmann (d. 1720) brought out an edition of the Viennese glosses of Hrabanus Maurus and in 1721 the Benedictine monk Bernhard Pez published the *Wessobrunner Gebet* and the glosses of Kero. As the final effort of this early eighteenth century group of scholars is to be regarded the *Glossarium Germanicum*, published in 1737 by Johann Georg Wachter. This dictionary takes all Germanic dialects into consideration and is of an etymological nature.

The most striking characteristic of the scholarship of the first three or four decades of the century is the definite limitation of interest to Old High German. While the greater number of the important monuments of this period are represented, Middle High German literature appears only in the few selections in Schilter's *Thesaurus* and some scattered publications. Among these are fifty-one fables by Ulrich Boner published by Scherz under the title *Philosophiae moralis Germanorum medii aevi specimina* (1704-1710), and a few years earlier Johann Christian Wagenseil's *Buch von der Meister-Singer Holdseligen Kunst Anfang, Fortübung, Nutzbarkeiten und Lehr-Sätzen*, which appeared as appendix to his *De civitate Norimbergensis Commentatio* (1697). We know, however, that the scholars of the period were familiar with many other MHG monuments. Melchior Goldast (1578-1635) devoted a good deal of attention to the Minnesingers in his *Scriptores rerum alamannicarum* (Frankfurt 1606, repr. 1661) and Daniel Morhof, whom Frick mentions in the Introduction to the *Thesaurus*, had a particular fondness for the MHG lyric, including even the folksong. The comparative neglect shown to the literature of the MHG period by scholars after 1700 is therefore not due to ignorance or lack of appreciation, but rather to the charm of the greater age of the older monuments. The character of the work of Schilter and

his contemporaries bears out this theory. The primary interest of all these men was not of a literary, cultural or philosophical nature, but purely linguistic. They were trying to understand the relations of Germanic dialects to each other and were seeking the common source. It is only natural, therefore, that they should turn first to the oldest available monuments and devote their efforts to these rather than to the products of, to them, comparatively recent times.

I General Treatment of Older Literature.[11]

a) Biographical

Johann Frick's introduction to Schilter's *Thesaurus* shows the strong interest that was manifested in scholars and writers of earlier periods. It is not astonishing, therefore, to find an attempt in the same decade to present biographically the history of Prussian scholarship. This effort is made in *Das gelehrte Preuszen. Auszug aus allerhand Büchern, nach gelehrter Männer Leben* (Thorn 1725), published in four volumes under the editorship of Michael Lilienthal.[12] It is a fairly complete record of

11) It is not the purpose of this discussion to rephrase statements of standard works on the history of Germanic philology in the eighteenth century. Nor is it intended to quote here in detail the bibliographical references contained in such works. Partial treatment of this period and general bibliography may be found in Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie* (2d ed.), Vol. I; Goedeke, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung* (2d ed.), Vols. I, II and III; Raumer, *Geschichte der germanischen Philologie.* Publications cited in these works will be mentioned here only when they are of such importance as to be indispensable to the discussion. In general the bibliographical references cited here are intended to supplement those of the three works mentioned.

12) This work is an outgrowth of and a supplement to *Das erläuterte Preuszen oder Anmerkungen über verschiedene zur Preuszischen Kirchen- und Civilihistorie gehörigen Dinge* (Königsberg 1724) IV, edited by Lilienthal, S. G. Bayer, Joh. Jac. Rhode, Chn. Volprecht, Dan. Hnr. Arnoldus, G. Dan. Seyler.

lives and works of important Prussians of the 16th and 17th centuries and a particularly valuable reference work on the Silesian and Königsberg poets.[13] A more ambitious publication, both in scope and in style, is Jakob Brucker's *Ehrentempel der deutschen Gelehrsamkeit, in welchem die Bildnisse gelehrter Männer unter den Deutschen aus dem 15., 16., und 17. Jahrhundert ausgestellt sind* (Augsburg 1747). It is a large quarto volume, illustrated with forty-seven engraved portraits by J. J. Haid.[14]

All previous biographical works, however, fade into insignificance before that of Christian Gottfried Jöcher (1694-1758). His encyclopedia was conceived as a collection of universal scope to include scholars of all nations and of all time. The first edition appeared in 1715 while its author was still a student. He was not satisfied with the result, however, and it was enlarged twice before 1733.[15] By this time he had come to regard it as his life-work and in 1750-1751 it finally appeared again as *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, darinnen die Gelehrten aller Stände beschrieben werden* in four large quarto volumes. It contains approximately 76,000 entries with references to about 300 earlier biographical works. Because of its universality and completeness of individual records it must still be regarded today as Germany's greatest biographical work. After Jöcher's death there were two attempts to revise and enlarge it. Johann Christoph Adelung (1732-1806) published two volumes[16]

13) Daniel Heinrich Arnoldt, *Historie der Königsbergischen Universität* (Königsberg 1747-1769) IV, supplements the biographies of these writers.

14) According to Kayser it was reprinted about 1770 but I have been unable to verify this.

15) *Compendiöses Gelehrten-Lexicon*, 3. Aufl. (Leipzig 1733). I have been unable to see the earlier editions; in fact I fail to find even a reference to the second edition.

16) Leipzig 1784.

including letters A-J and Heinrich Wilhelm Rotermund continued it to the letter R.[17] By this time the appearance of K. H. Jördens, *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*[18] had filled the demand for a German biographical work and the revision of Jöcher was discontinued.

In conclusion, mention should be made of an unpublished biographical work of some importance. In 1728 Georg Jakob Schwindel (1684-1752) completed his *Pandectae Theologico-Litterariae oder allgemeines gelehrtes Priester-Lexikon,* intended for publication in fifteen folio volumes. Its title does not quite render justice to its scope, since it includes not only clergymen but also laymen and gives particularly valuable information concerning scholars in Nürnberg and genealogies of prominent families of that city. Schwindel, who wrote under various pseudonyms (in this instance Ge. Jac. Scotomius but more frequently Theophilus Sincerus), was an ardent bibliophile. A few of his bibliographies were published but the greater and perhaps more important part of his works remained in manuscript. For the student of Nürnberg and its history his work is second in importance only to Wagenseil's *De civitate Norimbergensis Commentatio.*

b) Bibliographical

Although Goedeke rather thoroughly exhausts the resources of bibliographical material for the first half of the eighteenth century he does so without comment on individual works. A brief survey of the two most important bibliographers before 1750 is not out of place. Johann Georg Schelhorn (1694-1773), a clergyman who

17) Four additional volumes (Delmenhorst 1810 ff.)

18) Leipzig 1806-1811, VI. This work is so well known that discussion of it seems unnecessary.

lived the greater part of his active life in Memmingen, was a literary historian in the purest sense of the word. His bibliographies, interspersed with essays, seem to issue from an antiquarian joy in old books. They are entirely uncritical and quite remote from any application to contemporary language and literature. Particularly his earlier Latin works[19] show an interest extending to classical as well as to older German literature, with especial emphasis on the pietists of the seventeenth century. His most valuable work is his latest: *Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchengeschichte und Literatur* (Ulm and Leipzig 1762-1764) in three large volumes. In addition to bibliographical references it contains letters, documents and biographies of the pietist period.

A similar spirit imbued Georg Jakob Schwindel whose bibliographical works were published under the name of Theophilus Sincerus. He approached his task in an even less critical spirit than Schelhorn and his lists of books lack the sprightly essays that enliven those of his contemporary.[20] In addition to his published works, a large mass of manuscript material by Schwindel is preserved in the Stadtbibliothek in Nürnberg.

For the latter half of the century Goedeke's entries are not quite so thorough.[21] His most important bibliographical source, although only for a limited period, is Josef Anton Riegger, *Amoenitates literariae Friburgenses*

19) *Amoenitates litterariae* (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1725-1734) XIV, and *Amoenitates historiae ecclesiasticae et litterariae* (Leipzig 1737-1738) II. Goedeke fails to mention the latter.

20) With the exception of *Neue Nachrichten von lauter alten Büchern* (Frankfurt 1748) Schwindel's published works are listed in Goedeke 2II, 2-3.

21) Two omissions of apparent importance are J. Barth. Riederer, *Nachrichten zur Kirchen-, Gelehrten- und Büchergeschichte* (Nürnberg 1763-1767) IV, and *Abhandlungen aus der Kirchen-, Gelehrten- und Büchergeschichte* (Nürnberg 1768-1769). Verified in Heinsius.

(Ulm 1775, repr. 1779). This extremely valuable work deals chiefly with Geiler von Kaisersberg and Jacob Wimpheling along with the men from their immediate surroundings, such as Conrad and Peter Wickram. A part of the first volume is devoted to Johann Pfeffer and another to a complete list of the rectors of the Albertina.

One of the most interesting bibliographers of this period fails to find recognition in Goedeke. This is Bernhard Friedrich Hummel (d. 1791) who published four large works: *Neue Bibliothek von seltenen und sehr seltenen Büchern und kleinen Schriften*[22] (Nürnberg 1775-1782) III; *Bibliothek der deutschen Alterthümer* (Nürnberg 1787, 2d ed. 1791); *Compendium der deutschen Alterthümer* (1788); *Beschreibung entdeckter Alterthümer in Deutschland* (1792). Hummel was particularly interested in the oldest German period and therefore limited his material to the time before the death of Charlemagne. His bibliographies are arranged systematically according to subject-matter including history, geography, religion, laws, government, economic conditions, customs, etc.

Hummel's motives for his work are interesting. In the introduction to the *Bibliothek der deutschen Alterthümer*, which he considers his most important work, he expresses his regret at the lack of interest in Germanic antiquities and his hope that he might help to restore this subject to public favor. At the same time he speaks of the many scholars and bibliophiles who feel the need of a work such as he is about to undertake. He approaches his labors in the spirit of Bodmer rather than of Gottsched; that is, his attitude is not critical or pedantic but rather aesthetic and admiring. One begins to feel the

---

22) An earlier edition of this work appeared in 1770 under the name of the publisher, Johann Jakob Bauer, with a large supplementary volume *(Zusatz)* in 1774. Hummel did most of the work on the original volume and all on the supplement.

influence of Herder, Gerstenberg and Adelung and the approach of a romantic appreciation rather than of rationalistic appraisal of older literature.

The crowning bibliographical work of this period,[23] one which has never been supplanted in its field, is Georg Wolfgang Panzer, *Annalen der älteren deutschen Litteratur* (Nürnberg 1788) II, with its supplements, *Zusätze zu den Annalen* (Leipzig 1802) and *Der Annalen Zweiter Theil* (1805). This work is so well known that it requires no further description, save that it is the most complete existing record of German books from the invention of printing to 1526.

With the beginning of the nineteenth century and the inauguration of Germanistic studies by the Romanticists, work in the bibliographical field lags noticeably for several decades. At first sight this seems surprising; in all other branches of Germanic scholarship we find unprecedented activity while this one is neglected. But this neglect clearly grows out of the nature of Romanticism. Interest in older literature is no longer purely antiquarian; it is no longer coldly scientific and rationalistic. On the contrary, it is emotional, nationalistic, in short, romantic. The diligent ardor of scholars is directed toward the most rapid publication possible of the largest number of older documents. They find no time for anything as abstract as bibliographical co-ordination of their discoveries. Only as the romantic ardor cools, as a new

---

23) Among the many works that have escaped notice the following appear sufficiently important to deserve mention: Kaspar v. Häffelin, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Alterthümer* (München 1782); Fr. v. Adelung, *Nachrichten von altdeutschen Gedichten* (Königsberg 1796-1799); Paul Jak. Bruns, *Beiträge zur kritischen Bearbeitung alter Handschriften, Druck- und Urkunden* (Braunschweig 1802-1803); Karl Faber, *Preussisches Archiv oder Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Vorzeit* (Königsberg 1809).

generation surveys the achievements of 1800 to 1830, bibliography returns to its own.

c) Historico-critical.

The varying currents of eighteenth century scholarship are nowhere as clearly apparent as in the approach to literary history. Each new tendency in literature produces a new attitude toward the study of older writings. This is only natural, for the distinction between literature as a scholarly pursuit and literature as an aesthetic product is a purely academic one. That is, we may, for practical purposes, distinguish between Lessing, the scholar, and Lessing, the writer. But, in a wider sense, these two personalities are inseparable, for Lessing's scholarly attitude is founded upon his literary creed and his literary products are colored by his scholarly attainments. Even a literary historian and critic who is not at the same time a creative writer, can face the problems of older literature only from the point of view of his own period. He may be a leader and help to shape the point of view of his period, but this does not alter the situation. Gottsched's attitude toward literary history was critically rationalistic. In this respect it was typical of his period. That he helped to produce rationalism in Germany does not make his attitude the less typical. Thus, as we review the literary historical activities of the eighteenth century we find that they reflect faithfully the prevailing literary creeds.

It is no altogether easy task to draw lines of distinction between biographical, bibliographical and historical interest in the first four decades of the century. Such works as Arnoldt's *Historie der Kőnigsbergischen Universität* or Schelhorn's *Amoenitates literariae* might well be classified as works of literary history. The most definite remark that could be made about them is

that the apparent dominant interest in the former is biographical and in the latter bibliographical. Both of them are historical and neither is critical. The common characteristic of these works, as well as of all others of a similar nature in the early decades of the century, is their purely antiquarian nature. The writers exercise no critical judgment, they make no comparisons, they draw no conclusions. They seek no application of literary principles to their own writing, they point out nothing as commendable or worthy of imitation.

With the beginning of the activity of Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-1766) a new attitude toward literary history and criticism is immediately discernible. Research in older literature is no longer prompted by a purely antiquarian interest but rather by a desire to study critically the language and methods of older writers and to make application of their principles to contemporary speech. "Den grosszen Einflusz, den sich Gottsched erwarb, verdankte er theils seinem wirklich rühmenswerten Eifer für die deutsche Sprache und der nüchtern überlegten Auffassung seines Gegenstands, theils dem Geschick, mit dem er die Richtung seines Zeitalters für sich auszubeuten wuszte, die von allen Seiten dahin gieng, die deutsche Schriftsprache zu einem den älteren Kultursprachen ebenbürtigen Werkzeuge der literarischen Tätigkeit zu machen."[24]) With the recognition of this motive it becomes apparent that Gottsched's activities in the older literature are only in search for material to be used in his great grammatical works, *Deutsche Sprachkunst* (4th ed. 1757) and *Deutsche Sprachlehre* (1759). His approach to literary history is thoroughly rationalistic, one might almost say, utilitarian. That his publications in some instances served to arouse

24) Raumer, p. 207.

an aesthetic interest in older literature does not alter this fact.[25]

In 1740 Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698-1783) published his *Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* and precipitated the feud between Zürich and Leipzig that ended with the defeat and utter discrediting of Gottsched. The Swiss critics proposed a new approach to the study of literature and it was not long before scholarship fell into line. The work of Bodmer and Breitinger themselves can scarcely be regarded as scholarly research, particularly as it was motivated by a desire to popularize older literature. But their influence was sufficiently strong to bring about a complete change in approach and methods of scholarship. While the interest of the first three decades of the century had been purely antiquarian, and of the next three critical, we now find the beginnings of a cultural interest. Gottsched and the rationalists had sought in older literature models for the improvement of language and literary style of the period. Bodmer and the pre-Romanticists delved into the old books and manuscripts with a lively interest in habits and customs, public and private life, philosophy and religion. For the first time the word "Sittengeschichte" began to assume an important role in research.

---

25) The following works contain the chief results of Gottsched's research in older literature: *Nöthiger Vorrat zur Geschichte der deutschen dramatischen Dichtung* (Leipzig 1757-1765); *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (Leipzig 1732-1744) VIII; *Neuer Büchersaal der schönen Wissenschaften und freien Künste* (Leipzig 1745-1754) X; *Heinrich von Veldeke* (Progr. Leipzig 1745); *De temporibus Teutonicorum vatum mythicis* (Progr. Leipzig 1752). His edition of *Reineke Vos* will be discussed later.

In short, literary history in a wider sense began to make its appearance.[26]

The first complete history of German literature is a product of this period just preceding the beginnings of Romanticism. It is Erduin Julius Koch, *Compendium der deutschen Litteratur bis auf das Jahr 1781* (Berlin 1791-1795). Throughout the entire period of Romantic research, this book, supplemented but not displaced, remained the standard literary history, until the appearance of August Koberstein's *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Nationallitteratur* (Leipzig 1827). In the three decades intervening between the two books a flood of publications[27] had added vastly to the fund of knowledge

---

26) The following works that have not found their way into standard bibliographies are typical of this period: K. G. Küttner, *Charaktere deutscher Dichter von Karl dem Grossen bis 1780* (Berlin 1780-1781) II; J. C. Adelung, "Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Dichter und Gedichte aus dem altschwäbischen Zeitpunkte," *Magazin f. d. deutsche Sprache* II, 3 (1784), 3-92; D. H. Hegewisch, *Charaktere und Sittengemälde aus der deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* (Leipzig 1786); *Allgemeine Übersicht der deutschen Kulturgeschichte bis zu Maximilian I* (Hamburg 1788); Franz Gaszler, *Beiträge zur deutschen Sittengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Wien 1790); J. J. Eschenburg, *Denkmäler altdeutscher Dichtkunst beschrieben und erläutert* (Bremen 1799); C. F. R. Vetterlein, *Handbuch der poetischen Literatur der Deutschen* (Köthen 1799).

27) The following literary historical works before 1820 are not included in standard bibliographies: J. C. Adelung, *Älteste Geschichte der Deutschen, ihrer Sprache und Litteratur bis zur Völkerwanderung* (Leipzig 1806); G. F. Benecke, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altdeutschen Litteratur und Sprache* (Göttingen 1810); F. Weckherlin, *Beiträge zur Geschichte altdeutscher Sprache und Dichtkunst* (Stuttgart 1811); v. d. Hagen und Büsching, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Poesie von den ältesten Zeiten bis in das 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1812); F. D. Gräter, *Sämmtliche Schriften über nordische Mythologie und Dichtkunst* (Esling 1812); N. H. Julius, *Bibliotheca Germanoglottica oder Versuch einer Litteratur der Alterhümer etc.* (Hamburg 1817); Batt, Babo, Eitenbenz, Mone u. K. J. Weber, *Deutsche Denkmäler* (Heidelberg 1820 ff.)

and had made a new literary history necessary, but Koch's *Compendium* is still regarded today as the crowning work of its kind in the eighteenth century.

II. Oldest Literature.

Scholarly interest in the oldest Germanic literature is generally of an antiquarian nature and pursues either a linguistic or a historical objective. That this was true at the outset of the eighteenth century has been shown in connection with the earlier publications. The same characteristics hold true throughout the century. After 1800 there seem to be indications that the historical interest predominates and that particularly legal documents occupy the scholarly attention. For this reason it seems fitting to include in this section editions of chronicles and other historical documents that originated after the oldest periods.

a) Gothic and Scandinavian.

After the return of the Codex Argenteus to Germanic soil a continued interest in it is manifested. This is due in part to its theological character and in part to its great age. In the eighteenth century this interest does not wane and the Gothic Bible and its translator are frequent subjects for research. Detailed treatment here is not necessary as this work has been repeatedly and completely done.[28)]

The introduction to the third volume of Schilter's *Thesaurus* shows that German scholars were well acquainted with older Scandinavian literature. Both the *Younger* and the *Older Edda* are mentioned here, also Snorre Sturlusson, Saemund, Saxo and others. There is

28) Goedeke 2I, 7 ff.; 484. Also Konrad Burdach, "Die nationale Aneignung der Bibel und die Anfänge der germanischen Philologie," in *Festschrift für Eugen Mogk* (Halle 1924) 231-334.

no German edition of the *Edda*, however, until 1812 when v. d. Hagen published *Die Lieder der sämundischen Edda*. This seems surprising, especially since Scandinavian scholars had devoted much attention to it throughout the eighteenth century.[29]

After 1812, of course, there is a perfect flood of Eddic publications, in keeping with the efforts of the Romanticists to claim for Germany the literature of other Germanic countries. Long before the Romantic period, however, an edition of Saxo had been prepared in Germany. This is Chr. A. Klotz, *Saxonis Grammatici Historiae danicae Libri XVI* (Leipzig 1772).

b) Old High German.

Schilter and Scherz had published so much of the Old High German literature that little of importance was left to be done. We find, then, throughout the century following the *Thesaurus*, only a few republications of material which it contained: one edition of Williram's *Hohes Lied*,[30] two editions of the *Annolied*, one of the *Ludwigslied* and one of Otfrid's *Krist*. The *Wessobrunner Gebet*, which is not included in the *Thesaurus* but had been published by Bernhard Pez in 1721, was republished four times between 1766 and 1812; the *Hildebrandslied* was neglected for almost a century, from 1732 to 1808. A striking interest is manifested in the *Waltharilied*; this Latin poem had two editions, in 1780 and 1792, and is repeatedly subject for comment in periodicals before 1800.

---

29) Cf. Goedeke 2I, 170 ff. There is, however, a popularly conceived translation of the *Edda* by Schimmelmann in 1777.

30) D. G. Schöber, *Salomo, das Hohe Lied, aus zwoen alten deutschen Handschriften* (Augsburg 1752). This has been overlooked in all bibliographies. All other works mentioned here are listed in Goedeke 2I.

c) Linguistic Studies.

No field of Germanistic scholarship in the eighteenth century presents evidences of greater activity than the linguistic field. At the very beginning of the period we find the diligent group of men centering about Schilter busily engaged in both general and specialized research. The glossary which occupies the third volume of the *Thesaurus* has been discussed, likewise the excellent *Glossarium Germanicum* (1737) by Wachter. Diederich von Stade's *Grammatik der Sprache Otfrid's* (1710), unfortunately not published, but preserved in manuscript at Bremen, indicates that the linguistic interest extended beyond the lexicographic field to the grammatic.

A representative figure in the field of linguistic research in the first half of the century is Christian Gottlob Haltaus (1702-1758). His efforts were inspired by juristic-antiquarian interest and the sources of his glossaries were the legal documents of the Middle Ages. His first publication, *Specimen glossarii fori Germanici ex diplomatibus* (Leipzig 1738) was merely a prelude to a lexicographical masterpiece which to this day remains an indispensable tool to the study of the legal language of older Germany, the *Glossarium Germanicum medii aevi maximam partem e diplomatibus praterea aliis monimentis tam editis quam ineditis adornatum* (Leipzig 1758). Another dictionary that originated in this period, though it did not appear in print until later, was the *Glossarium Germanicum medii aevi*, the life-work of Johann Georg Scherz, published in 1781, after his death, by J. J. Oberlin. Its scope, in keeping with Scherz' interests, is more general than that of Haltaus' works.

Friedrich Karl Fulda (1724-1788) extended his studies to general linguistics and indulged in abstract

speculations in his *Origo linguae humanae.*[31] His two chief works, however, represent a real contribution to Germanic linguistics: *Über die beiden Hauptdialecte der Teutschen Sprache* (Leipzig 1773) and *Sammlung und Abstammung germanischer Wurzel-Wőrter, nach der Reihe menschlicher Begriffe* (Halle 1776).

Research in Germanic dialects had begun to bear fruits as early as the end of the seventeenth century. Under the leadership of Gottfried Leibniz a number of glossaries of the Low German language were begun, Joh. Ludwig Prasch (1637-1690) published a "Glossarium Bavaricum"[32] and Christian Meisner added a Silesian one to his record of the Sprachgesellschaften, *Silesia loquens* (Wittenberg 1705). From these small beginnings dialect study made rapid strides forward and before the end of the century a large number of local dictionaries had been published and even the peculiarities of certain speech-islands had been subjected to scrutiny. This interest in dialects is particularly amazing in view of the general belief that admiration for local language and literature came as an accompaniment to Romanticism.[33]

d) Historical Studies.

Although Schilter was undoubtedly less interested in the historical than in the linguistic aspect of his documents, yet the inclusion of the *Salic Law* and *Schwabenspiegel* in his *Thesaurus* stimulated research in chronicles and legal documents. In 1745 the Benedictine monk

---

31) Cf. J. Chr. Zahn, "Nachricht von dem Leben und den Schriften Friedrich Karl Fulda's," in *Ulfilas gothische Bibelübersetzung etc.* (Weissenfels 1805), p. III ff.

32) As appendix to his *Dissertatio altera de origine Germanica Latinae linguae* (Regensburg 1689).

33) For complete treatment on research in dialects cf. Raumer, 242 ff. and Paul 2I, 2. — Not mentioned elsewhere is Chr. Dn. Anderson, *Hamburgische Burspraken aus dem Jahre 1594 nach dem Original* (Hamburg 1810).

Hieronymus Pez (d. 1762) published the *Reimchronik des Ottokar von Horneck*. This is the first of a long series of publications of chronicles running uninterruptedly through the latter half of the century and continuing into the next. The nature of such material is almost always purely local and it follows that the interest displayed in it must have been prompted by local pride and patriotism. In this respect it closely parallels the study of dialects. Again it is surprising to find what amounts to romantic interest in local antiquity in an age that is commonly presumed to have been devoid of appreciation of its own past.[34]

III. Middle High German Poetry

The so-called popular revival of older literature in the Romantic period stands squarely upon the MHG. epic. The year 1805, when v. d. Hagen[35] published his first excerpts from the *Nibelungenlied*, is popularly regarded as the beginning of the period of remarkable activity in older literature. Here again it is extremely difficult to draw the line of demarcation between scholarly and popular interest. Büsching and v. d. Hagen

---

34) Complete treatment and bibliography in Goedeke 2I, 56-59, 275-290; II, 287-315, 321-325; III, 27. Additions: J. J. Gallati, *Aegidius Tschudi, Hauptschlüssel zu verschiedenen Alterthümern* (Constanz 1758, repr. 1778); C. W. Gärtner, *Sachsenspiegel oder das sächsische Landrecht* (Leipzig 1732); C. Ulr. Grupen, *Deutsche Alterthümer zur Erläuterung des sächsischen und schwäbischen Land- und Lehnrechts* (Hannover 1746); id., *Origines Germanicae oder das älteste Deutschland* (Lemgo 1764-1768) IV; H. Grupen und Meermann, *Der Sachsenspiegel nach der raren Goudaischen Ausgabe von 1479 etc.* (Hannover 1762); Paul Jak. Bruns, *Beiträge zu den deutschen Rechten des Mittelalters etc.* (Helmstädt 1799); D. T. Wiarda, *Asega-Buch, ein altfriesisches Gesetzbuch* (Berlin 1805); *J. C. v. Aretin, Baiersche Tyrolsche Denkwürdigkeiten* (München 1806) II; C. Abel, *Sammlung einiger alter noch ungedruckter Chroniken, nebst einer Zugabe zu den deutschen und sächsischen Alterthümern* (Braunschweig 1814)

35) "Proben der Nibelungen nebst Auszug des Inhalts des Ganzen," *Eunomia* 1805 March, pp. 171-187.

and Docen and Aretin and the Grimms were, of course, primarily scholars, but their work is inextricably bound up in the popular literature of their period. The Schlegels, Tieck, Arnim, Brentano and Simrock, on the other hand, were primarily creative writers and their interest was purely aesthetic, but their contribution to Germanic scholarship was nevertheless valuable.

The duality of interest in MHG poetry dates from Bodmer's first efforts on behalf of the *Nibelungenlied.* Before 1757 the little interest that was displayed in MHG poetry was antiquarian in nature. Schilter's *Thesaurus,* it will be remembered, contained a number of MHG monuments, including the *Rolandslied,* Stricker's *Karl* and *König Tyrol.* The glossary further showed a familiarity with the *Alexanderlied, Heldenbuch, Trojanische Krieg* and other poems. The commentaries dealt only with the linguistic aspects of the material and entirely ignored the aesthetic side. The same onesidedness has been shown as a characteristic of Gottsched although it cannot be denied that such collections as his *Büchersaal* helped to spread a knowledge of MHG poetry.[36)]

Under the spreading influence of Bodmer and Breitinger the character of scholarly interest underwent a decided change. Their own works are so clearly designed to popularize older literature that they shall not be discussed here. But it was Bodmer's example that prompted his scholar Christoph Heinrich Myller (1740-1807) to prepare a semi-scholarly edition of a large number of MHG poetic monuments and so to anticipate by more than twenty years the wholesale revival by the Romantic-

---

36) Bibliography of MHG poetry in early 18th century is to be found in Goedeke, Raumer and Paul. The following is not mentioned: Bernhard Wiedeburg, *Ausführliche Nachrichten von einigen deutschen poetischen Manuscripten aus dem 13. und 14. Jahrhundert* (Jena 1754).

ists. This work, *Sammlung deutscher Gedichte aus dem XII., XIII. und XIV. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1784-1785) III, grew into a formidable collection out of what was originally intended as an unpretentious reprint of Bodmer's *Nibelungenlied.* Myller's *Nibelungen,* prepared on the basis of MSS. A and C, appeared in 1782. It was followed in the next year by an edition of the *Eneidt.* Later these two monuments became part of the first volume of the large collection along with *Der Gott Amur, Parsifal, Der Arme Heinrich* and several minor monuments. The second volume included Gottfried's *Tristan,* "Vribert's" (Heinrich von Freiberg) *Tristan, Flore und Blanscheflur, Iwein, Freidank* and some Meisterlieder. The third volume contains Conrad von Würzburg's *Trojanischer Krieg* and a number of fragments and minor poems.

It is only natural, of course, that this work could not bear the searching light of later philological accuracy, but it is a representative product of eighteenth-century efforts on behalf of MHG epics and romances. It clearly shows the new trend, soon to be followed by Adelung, Gräter and others who were to usher in the scholarship of the new century.

IV. Meistergesang, Fable, Drama

While the scholars of a rationalistic age found little of interest in the epics and romances of an earlier period, they displayed all the more activity on behalf of the older didactic literature and its related genres. Just as Gellert, Rabener, Hagedorn and Weisse stood in most intimate relation with the earlier fabulists, so scholarship also found much that was attractive in Erasmus Alberus, Sebastian Franck, Bartolomäus Ringwalt, Ulrich Boner and many other writers of the same character. The Sprachgesellschaften of the seventeenth century had

entered upon the heritage of the Meistersänger and had perpetuated their tradition. Toward the end of the century, as the character of the Sprachgesellschaften became constantly more scholarly, the Meistersänger tradition passed almost entirely into the hands of scholars. The many hundreds of books dealing with the principles of the poetic art,[37] beginning with Opitz and culminating with Gottsched, clearly show the interest in and respect for the Meistersänger.[38] Bibliographies, such as Sincerus, *Neue Nachrichten*, devote a great deal of attention to them and Gottsched's linguistic works discuss them at length. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, however, with the growing interest in the epics and romances, there is a marked diminution of activity in the field of Meistergesang; references to it are restricted to learned periodicals.[39]

The popular revival of Hans Sachs is generally and perhaps wrongly attributed to Goethe. This question will be discussed at length later. But the scholarly interest in Hans Sachs continued uninterruptedly through the eighteenth century. As early as 1765 an excellent biography of him appeared[40] and Gottsched had called attention to his dramatic works at an even earlier time. Whatever Goethe's part in the popular revival of this poet may have been, the scholarly foundation had long been laid.[41]

---

37) Cf. Goedeke 2III, 20 ff.

38) Note the implication in such titles as Johann Ernst Philippi, *Regeln und Maximen der edlen Reimschmiedekunst, auch kriechender Poesie, von einem ehrbaren Mitgliede der Hans Sachsen und Froschmäuseler-Gesellschaft* (Altenburg 1743).

39) For bibliography cf. Goedeke 2II, 248 ff.

40) Salomon Ranisch, *Historisch-kritische Lebensbeschreibung Hanns Sachsens* (Altenburg 1765).

41) For bibliography cf. Goedeke 2II, 411 ff.

Scholarly interest in the fabulists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries never waned, because Erasmus Alberus, Burchard Waldis, Hartmann Schopper and others were links in the chain that led to Aesop, Babrias, Phaedrus, the classicists of the fable. While this interest may have been somewhat perfunctory in the first half of the eighteenth century it became warm and vital when Gellert, Rabener, Weisse and others became attracted to the fable as a popular form. In the two or three decades following the popularization of the fable by these men numerous books, articles and programs were devoted not only to the fabulists mentioned above, but also to Sebastian Franck, Johannes Mathesius, Balthasar Schnurr, Bartolomäus Ringwalt and others. Ulrich Boner received more than his share of attention in the form of an edition of his *Edelstein*[42] and the interest in him was carried over into the Romantic period.

The animal epic is a literary form that is far more appealing to popular than to scholarly interest. It is in keeping with its character that we find several popular editions of *Reineke Vos* both before and after Goethe (1794) but only one scholarly translation, that of Gottsched (Leipzig 1752, repr. 1792). This poem had a continuous popular tradition, however, and was sufficiently well known to become the subject of occasional articles in learned journals.[43]

The older German drama received rather scant attention throughout the eighteenth century and the interest in it diminished rather than increased toward the end of the period. At the beginning of the century two works

---

42) J. J. Oberlin, *Bonerii Gemma* (Straszburg 1782).

43) For bibliography cf. Goedeke 2I, 480 ff.; an interesting addition not elsewhere noted is J. K. H. Dreyer, *Abhandlung vom Nutzen des Gedichtes Reinke de Vos in Erklärung der Rechtsalterthümer* (Wismar 1768).

appeared that dealt with a very limited phase of the drama.[44] After that no interest in the drama was manifested until Gottsched published his two valuable works, *Nöthiger Vorrat zur Geschichte der dramatischen Dichtkunst* and *Schaubühne*. Just as Gottsched's talents and accomplishments were overrated before 1760, so his services were minimized after his defeat by Bodmer. The magnitude and importance of his efforts on behalf of the older German drama were not appreciated until almost a century after the publication of these two works. Under the influence of Bodmer, Herder and the representatives of Sturm und Drang, the Shaksperian drama occupied the public attention to the exclusion of the older German dramatic products. Only occasional articles in learned journals dealt with individual dramatists, such as Hans Foltz, Hans Rosenplüt, Jakob Ayrer and a few others. Tieck's *Deutsches Theater* (1817) was the first attempt at a general treatment and remained the only work of its kind for several decades.

V. Theological Literature and Humanism.

Literature that is closely bound up with religion is very likely, of course, to have an uninterrupted tradition, both popular and scholastic. This is particularly true of controversial writings and of all literature that was connected with any of the several Protestant Reformations, for the controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants and the frequently even bitterer controversies between Protestant sects have remained living issues down to the present time. For the purposes of this discussion,

---

44) J. J. Müller, *Reichstagstheater unter Kaiser Friederich V. von 1440-1443 aus den actis publicis dargestellt* (Dresden 1719) II; *Reichstagstheater unter Kaiser Maximilian I. von 1486-1500* (Dresden 1719) II.

therefore, there is nothing to be gained by a detailed account of the eighteenth century scholarship centering about the life and works of Martin Luther and other reformers, of Thomas Murner and the controversialists of both sides, or even of Paul Gerhardt and the great host of writers of hymns and other works for spirtual edification. All these men have remained constantly in the public eye and the theologians have always concerned themselves with every phase of their activities. The same is true of saints' legends, saints' calendars, *Marienbüchlein* and other forms of spiritual literature which not only remained continually popular but were also subjects for research.

The unflagging interest in the Humanists and Neo-Latinists is somewhat more difficult to explain. There certainly can have been no popular appeal about Jacob Wimpheling, Crotus Rubeanus, Johannes Reuchlin, Conrad Celtes and others whose erudite Latin works were addressed only to a limited audience and whose very names can scarcely have been known to the general public in the eighteenth century. In fact, it is very likely that the Humanists and their writings were entirely unknown outside of academic circles. The interest displayed in them must, therefore, have been purely antiquarian, and this is borne out both by the character of the research and by the nature of the periodicals in which the results were published.[45)]

The writer whom the combined theological and antiquarian interest served to make the most fruitful subject for research was Ulrich von Hutten. As early as 1717 an excellent biography of him was published and throughout the entire century various of his works were printed again and again, both in Latin and in

---

45) Cf. Goedeke 2I, 405 ff.; II, 88 ff.

German translation. Even his correspondence was drawn into the light and discussed. Outside of his close association with Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation, the chief cause for the interest displayed in him was probably his co-authorship of the *Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum,* a subject of which German scholarship never lost sight.[46]

VI. The Seventeenth Century.

The bond which tied the eighteenth century to the seventeenth cannot be regarded as severed until the appearance of Bodmer's *Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* (1740). The spirit of the earlier period lived on in Gottsched and his followers and the tradition was not broken until German literature began to take on a new character. For this reason it is scarcely proper to speak of a "revival of interest" in seventeenth century literature, nor can scholarly activity in it be attributed to antiquarian motives. On the contrary, through at least the first half of the eighteenth century the literature of the preceding hundred years was regarded as living and present. For example, the attitude of Gottsched and Bodmer, and even of Lessing, toward Martin Opitz, was not the attitude of a new generation toward a great but nevertheless outlived writer of the past, but rather that of a group of young poets toward an older and highly respected contemporary. The scholarly activity that was devoted to the eighteenth

---

46) For bibliography of Ulrich von Hutten cf. Goedeke 2II, 228 ff. Not mentioned there are G. A. Wagner, *Ulrich von Huttens fünf Reden wider den Herzog Ulrich von Württemberg* (Chemnitz 1801); *Epistolas duas ad Richard Crocum* (Leipzig 1802); H. G. A. Wagner, *Leben Ulrichs von Hutten* (Leipzig 1803); J. J. Stolz *Ulrich von Hutten gegen D. Erasmus und Erasmus gegen Hutten* (Aarau 1813); Fr. *Fröhlich, Huttens Hermann Arminius* (Wien 1815); G. C. F. Mohnicke, *Huttens Klagen gegen W. Loetz und dessen Sohn Henning* (Greifswald 1816).

century was therefore in the nature of literary criticism and of a study of the methods of the older writers, with a view to the application of their principles to contemporary writing.

The center about which the study of this period revolved were the *Sprachgesellschaften.* While these literary societies had become practically extinct by the year 1700, they were still regarded with respect and their influence was considered a wholesome one. Beginning with Christian Meisner's *Silesia loquens* (Wittenberg 1705) scarcely a decade passed that did not produce a new work on these societies.[47] The most important of the earlier of these is Gottsched's *Geschichte der Stiftung der vormaligen Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft* (Weimar 1735) and the crowning works are Johann Melchior Heinze's two books, *Erzählung von der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft* (Weimar 1780) and *Vermischte Nachrichten aus den Acten der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft unter dem Schmackhaften* (ibid. 1781).

Of the individual writers of the seventeenth century scarcely one of importance was neglected. Opitz, of course, attracted most attention, but Harsdörffer, Robertin, Rist, Zesen, Scheffler received their proper share. Even comparatively obscure writers like Daniel von Czepko (1605-1660) were not overlooked.[48]

At least one interesting revival of a completely forgotten seventeenth century writer must be recorded here, however. About 1749 Gotthold Ephraim Lessing found in the university library at Wittenberg a small volume containing a poem entitled *Oesterliche Triumphposaune* by Andreas Scultetus (ca. 1625-1647). He became interested in this writer and ten years later, while

47) Cf. Goedeke 2III, 3 ff.; 72 ff.
48) Cf. Goedeke 2III under names of writers mentioned.

in Silesia, he devoted a good deal of time and energy to the search for more of Scultetus' poems. In 1771 he published everything he had been able to find by and about this poet.[49] The result was a sudden interest in this obscure writer and the discovery and publication of several more of his poems.[50] This case is important, since it is the only authentic revival of an entirely forgotten earlier poet by an eighteenth century writer. Lessing-Ramler's republication of Logau's *Sinngedichte* cannot be regarded as a similar case, since Logau may have been long neglected, but was surely not forgotten.

---

49) Lachmann-Maltzahn 8, 353-402.

50) J. G. Jachmann, *Nachlese* etc. (Breslau 1774) and H. Scholtz, *Zweite Nachlese* etc. (ibid. 1783).

CHAPTER III: POPULAR INTEREST IN OLDER GERMAN LITERATURE AFTER 1740.

The year 1740 represents one of the great turning points in the history of German literature. In the century and a half preceding this date the literature of Germany had fallen from the heights of artistic perfection which it had reached in the time of Hans Sachs, had wallowed through the slough of bad taste of the Silesians, had struggled against the engulfing Italian influence and had sought to find its road by the reflected brilliance of French classicism. It was a century and a half of apparently aimless striving, of directionless movement that began nowhere and ended nowhere. And yet, viewed in the light of literary history, it represents a period of preparation, a period of purification and refining by means of foreign models, a period that slowly and almost imperceptibly educated the public taste to the proper appreciation of literary form and literary content.

A double significance lies in the year 1740. In the first place it was the year of the accession of Frederick the Great to the crown of Prussia. Although he himself admired everything that was French and decried everything that was German, yet his domestic as well as his foreign policies became powerful factors in the promotion of national literature. "Ich habe von Jugend auf kein deutsches Buch gelesen," said Frederick to Gottsched in their conversation of October 15, 1757, "und je parle comme un cocher, jetzo aber bin ich ein alter Kerl von 46 Jahren und habe keine Zeit mehr dazu." He was a prolific writer, but his books were all in French; yet his spirit was thoroughly German and his writings form a valuable contribution to German literature. His well-governed, powerful state became a safe haven for his subjects and

fostered a strong nationalistic spirit. His tolerant religious attitude permitted a free development of intellect and imagination; the simplicity and naturalness of the ruler and his court produced a corresponding tendency in literature, a cult of friendship, a Horatian joy in nature. The great deeds of the king, in politics and in war, furnished worthy material for the poets and inspired their pride in Germany's glorious past. "Der erste wahre und höhere eigentliche Lebensgehalt kam durch Friedrich den Groszen und die Thaten des siebenjährigen Krieges in die deutsche Poesie," says Goethe in the seventh book of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*[51] and the added perspective of another century that has passed since this utterance makes this fact more evident than ever.

The second notable event of the year 1740 was the almost simultaneous publication of Bodmer's *Kritische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* and Breitinger's *Kritische Dichtkunst.* The previous decade had witnessed Gottsched firmly enthroned upon the high seat of German literary art. As though from Sinai he handed down his *Ausführliche Redekunst* (1728) and his *Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst* (1730) to a reverently appreciative generation. With the autocratic attitude of an absolute despot he crowned and uncrowned poets and gathered about him a galaxy of satellites, some of whom were far superior to him in originality and taste, but failed to realize it. But in 1739 he severed his relations with his academy, the "Deutsche Gesellschaft," and in the following year Zürich began its famous attack upon him. In 1741 the Neuber theatrical troupe ridiculed him as "der Tadler" on the stage of his own stronghold, Leipzig, and in 1744 his own disciples, Gellert, Rabener and Zachariä, deserted his official organ, *Belustigungen des Verstandes und Witzes,* to found the *Bremer Beiträge.*

51) *Werke* (Weimar) 27, 104.

From this point on his road led rapidly down hill, so rapidly and so far, that in 1765 Goethe, as a student in Leipzig, briefly reports: "Ganz Leipzig verachtet ihn; niemand geht mit ihm um." But Gottsched's mission to German literature had been fulfilled. He had restored the German language to its proper place, had cleared away the weeds of foreign influence and had prepared the soil for the fruit that presently began to ripen. Soon Gellert and Rabener, Hagedorn, Ramler and Gleim, Klopstock and finally Lessing, together with a host of others began to produce the new literature in a new and brighter era.

Meanwhile the reading public had to content itself with the literature that had been preserved from earlier periods. The decades immediately preceding 1740 had produced practically nothing of lasting popular appeal. In the seventeenth century, to be sure, Zesen, Bucholtz, Zigler-Kliphausen, Moscherosch, Grimmelshausen and Reuter had written huge, cumbersome novels that were constantly reprinted and enjoyed continued popularity far into the following century. The sixteenth-century satirists, the fabulists, the writers of the Reformation period, the mystics were almost all preserved by continuous tradition. In fact, with few exceptions, practically the entire printed literature of Germany was not only available to the educated reader, but was actually read. One type of literature, however, composed the great bulk of the reading material in the middle of the eighteenth century and, by its nature, formed the strongest connecting link with the past. This type is the *Volksbuch*.

I. The Volksbuch.

A detailed history of the *Volksbuch* is out of place

here; it has been repeatedly and thoroughly written.[52] A brief account of the nature of these books, however, may help to explain their long-continued popularity and to determine their position in the pattern of eighteenth century literature. The majority of the *Volksbücher* originated at the very beginning of the New High German period at a time when education became more general in the lower classes and when the newly discovered art of printing made large editions possible. Their material was drawn from every conceivable source available in the period of their origin: saints' legends, tales of Oriental origin, Italian Renaissance tales, adventure stories, chivalric romances, books on magic, anecdotes, jest-books, books on fortune-telling, dreams, riddles, popular medicine, in fact the entire gamut of material that makes up the general European literature of the Middle Ages. In the course of the three following centuries a very few of the *Volksbücher* dropped into oblivion and in their places a few new ones appeared. Among the latest to join the ranks were *Faust, Genoveva, Der ewige Jude* and, as late as 1727, *Der gehörnte Siegfried.*

The continued popularity of these books is easily traced by the frequent reprints that appeared at short intervals throughout the seventeenth and even well into the eighteenth century. Particular significance, of course, attaches to the date of final publication in each case, since that date marks the gradual waning of popular interest in the story in its older form. When the editions of such a book that had been reprinted at ten to twenty year intervals for a century suddenly cease, the conclusion is not necessarily that the public has lost

---

52) Josef Görres, *Die teutschen Volksbücher* (Heidelberg 1807); Felix Bobertag, *Geschichte des Romans in Deutschland* (Breslau 1876); Richard Benz, *Die deutschen Volksbücher* (Jena 1913); Lutz Mackensen, *Die deutschen Volksbücher* (Leipzig 1927).

interest. It may be that the material has been adopted by a skillful writer and has been reworked into a form that makes a more general appeal, so that the new version replaces the older *Volksbuch*. The final eighteenth-century edition of *Die schöne Magelone* is in 1744. Since the decades immediately following this date have produced no literary reworking of the material, it is to be assumed that the popular demand for this book had ceased. In the case of *Melusine* the last popular edition of the book was published in 1750. The material reappears, however, in 1772, from the pen of Friedrich Wilhelm Zachariä[53] and it is scarcely too bold to assume that this version replaced the *Volksbuch* in popular favor.

The more important *Volksbücher* that found their way into the latter half of the eighteenth century are the following, each with the date of its last printing: *Artemidori groszes und vollkommenes Traumbuch*, 1753; *Der ewige Jude*, 1756; *Pontus and Sidonia*, 1769; *Valentin und Namelos*, 1784; *Fortunatus*, 1787; *Albertus Magnus, von den Geheimnissen der Weiber*, 1792; *Till Eulenspiegel*, 1794; *Hug Schapler*, 1794; *Die sieben weisen Meister*, 1800. A number of others, including *Melusine*, *Genoveva* and *Faust*, became subjects for contemporary literary treatment at an early date, with a varying effect upon the popularity of the original. *Melusine*, as already mentioned, disappeared as *Volksbuch* as a result of skillful contemporary treatment. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that Friedrich (Maler) Müller's dramatization *Golo und Genoveva* helped to make the *Volksbuch Genoveva* more popular than ever: it was reprinted at approximately five-year intervals until 1829.

The record of *Faust* throughout this century is particularly interesting. It was reprinted in 1702, 1712,

53) *Zwei neue schöne Mährlein* (Leipzig 1772).

1714, 1717, 1722, 1724, 1726, 1728, 1741, 1746 and 1797.[54] Toward the middle of the century, it will be noted, the frequency of the editions drops off and 1746 marks the end of the continuous tradition. Soon after that date the Faust material passed into the hands of the new generation of writers, notably Lessing, Herder and the various representatives of Sturm und Drang and found its finest expression, for the time, in Goethe's *Fragment* of 1790. The literary activity on the material undoubtedly again stimulated popular interest in the *Volksbuch Faust* and so became responsible for the reprint of 1797 which was followed by numerous editions in the opening decades of the nineteenth century.

The attitude of the writers of the period toward the *Volksbuch* underwent frequent changes in keeping with the varying literary currents. Gottsched, as might be expected, was entirely hostile toward this form of literature. In 1730 he expressed himself in violent terms concerning this "Schundliteratur" in his periodical *Der Biedermann*. His followers, even those who later left him, shared his dislike for all popular literature of the Middle Ages. Albrecht von Haller, for example, repeatedly voiced his disapproval of the earlier periods, of the Roman Church, of monastic scholasticism in such of his minor writings as his "Anzeige der Holmannschen Logik und Metaphysik"[55] and his view underwent no change even after his break with Gottsched. Hagedorn, Ramler and Rabener displayed no particular fondness for the *Volksbücher* and Bodmer and Breitinger confined their efforts on behalf of mediaeval literature to the higher levels of writing. Lessing's enthusiasm for everything

54) There were, of course, several distinct versions of the Faust story. In the list of dates given here no effort is made to distinguish between the several lines of tradition.

55) In *Sammlung kleiner Hallerischer Schriften* (Bern 1772), Dritter Theil.

pertaining to popular literature and his early interest in the Faust-material are too well known to require elaboration.[56] His occasional comments in the *Literaturbriefe* did much to raise the *Volksbücher* in the esteem of his contemporaries. The decided reaction toward older themes in Sturm und Drang and the influence of Herder finally re-established the literary credit of this humble form. Goethe, in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*,[57] cherished an affectionate memory of "diese schätzbaren Überreste der Mittelzeit" which were issued in wholesale quantities in the "factory" in Frankfurt. His comment, "eine Masse Schriften, die zwar in ihrer gegenwärtigen Gestalt nicht vortrefflich genannt werden können, deren Inhalt jedoch uns manches Verdienst voriger Zeiten in einer unschuldigen Weise näher bringt," shows that he held the Volksbücher in high esteem as source material, although he was quite aware of their formal shortcomings. In 1779 H. A. O. Reichard attempted the first large collection of *Volksbücher*,[58] a full two decades before the mass revival by the Romanticists began. At the beginning of the new century Tieck, Friedrich Schlegel and Dorothea Schlegel went to these old books for their materials and August Wilhelm Schlegel, in his introduction to Sophie von Knorring's *Flore und Blanscheflur*, says: "Der Geist der alten Dichtung, aus einem künstlerischen Sinne wiedergeboren, musz sich aufs Neue in einer sprechenden und einnehmenden Gestalt verkörpern."[59] The *Volks-*

---

56) Cf. *Werke* (Lachmann-Muncker) 5, 209; 8, 41 ff.

57) Cf. *Werke* (Weimar) 26, 51.

58) *Bibliothek der Romane* (Riga 1782-1794), XXI. The collection contains the following *Volksbücher:* Vol. 2: *Wigalois, Eulenspiegel.* 3: *Lanzelot, Margraf Walther, Eurialus und Lucretia.* 4: Additions to *Eulenspiegel.* 5: *Ogier, Camillo und Emilie.* 6: *Haimonskinder, Herzog Ernst.* 7: *Mörin.* 8. *Heinrich der Löwe.* 9: *Reineke Vos.* 13: *Gehörnte Siegfried.* 14: *Magelone.* 15: *Sieben weise Meister.* 19: *Pontus.* 21: *Tannhäuser, Der treue Eckart.*

59) A. W. Schlegel, *Werke* (Böcking) 7, 275.

buch had again come into its own and its material, under the skilled hands of Arnim, Brentano, Fouqué and others, blossomed into new life on the pages of Romantic literature. But no matter how much credit is due the Romanticists for their use of the *Volksbuch* material, their work can in no sense be regarded as a "revival." On the contrary, they merely raised to a higher level a literary form which had been constantly present, preserved by a continued, popular tradition.

II. M. H. G. Epics, Romances and Other Poems.

In the second half of the fifteenth century—in some instances even earlier—the materials of the MHG epics and romances passed into prose versions. In this form and its descendant, the*Volksbuch*, practically the entire courtly and heroic literature of the older periods was preserved. It was a convenient form for the publisher as well as for the reader,—for the publisher, because he could make linguistic innovations in keeping with the changing language without interfering with rhyme and rhythm, because he could make expansions and contractions with ease, and because the more condensed prose-form permitted economies in printing; for the reader, because, in general, prose is more easily read than poetry and because he did not need to struggle with linguistic archaisms that the poems surely would have retained. It is only natural, therefore, that the versified forms of the MHG epics and romances, existing only in manuscripts and a few early prints,[60] gradually passed out of the consciousness of the average reader and became the property of the scholars alone. Occasional comments on

60) Such as the *Heldenbuch;* the earliest known edition is without date and place of publication, copies in Göttingen, Berlin and Darmstadt; 2d ed. Augsburg 1491; 6th (final) ed. Frankfurt 1590.

isolated writers or classes of poetry, such as Goldast's remarks on the Minnesingers or Schilter's publication of the *Rolandslied* and other poems are the only evidence we possess to prove that this literature was not completely forgotten. We find no attempt, however, before the middle of the eighteenth century to popularize MHG poetry and we may be sure that the general public was practically unconscious of its existence.

To Johann Jacob Bodmer belongs the credit for the first attempt and the continued effort to popularize MHG poetry. His interest was first aroused by Goldast's *Minnesänger*, Schilter's *Thesaurus* and other scholarly works of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As early as 1734 he included *Die Winsbekin* in his *Character der teutschen Gedichte*. About ten years later, in a short article entitled "Von den poetischen Zeiten unter dem schwäbischen Stamme,"[61] he displayed a remarkable knowledge of writers of the thirteenth century and an equally remarkable ignorance of their works. He had heard of the Paris *Codex 7266* which was said to contain poems by Walther von der Vogelweide, Konrad von Würzburg, Reinmar von Zweter and other Minnesingers, and he suspected that this was the manuscript which Goldast had used. At the time he little realized what part this Codex was to play in the development of the study of literature and in his own career. "Hätten wir noch Hermanns von Sachsenhausen[62] Gedichte, die Möhrin genannt, Wolframs von Eschilbach starcken Rennewart,[63] eben desselben Gedichte von Margraf Wilhelm

---

61) In *Sammlung Critischer, Poetischer und anderer geistvollen Schriften* (Zürich 1743), Siebendes Stück, 25-53.

62) He means Hermann von Sachsenheim (d. 1458), a writer of inferior quality in the period of decadence.

63) *Der starke Rennewart* is Ulrich von Türheim's continuation of Wolfram's *Willehalm*.

von Narbone, desgleichen was er von Gamuret und seinem Sohne Parcifall gedichtet!" he exclaims, as he likewise regrets the loss of practically all of Minnesang. At the conclusion of the article he prints a fragment of some 250 lines of a MHG romance. He knows nothing of its origin or connection and the many textual errors plainly show that he scarcely understands the language. Maszmann later identified this fragment as part of an Upper German version of *Partonopeus und Meliur.*[64]

In the five years following the publication of this article Bodmer's studies in MHG literature must have been intensive. Through the aid of Schöpflin in Straszburg he secured the loan of the Paris *Codex 7266* and identified it as the manuscript which Goldast had used and which, after the capture of Heidelberg by Tilly, had been taken from there to Paris. Believing this codex to be the Manesse collection which the Minnesinger Hadlaub mentions, he called it the *Manessische Handschrift* and, in spite of later evidence to the contrary, the name has been retained to this day. In 1748 Bodmer and Breitinger together published *Proben der alten schwäbischen Poesie des dreyzehnten Jahrhunderts. Aus der Manessischen Sammlung.* This small volume marks the beginning of popular interest in MHG poetry. Its immediate effect was not remarkable; the literary world continued to move in its rationalistic path and gave scant heed to the old poems. But Bodmer and Breitinger were not discouraged. Under their influence Professor B. C. B. Wiedeburg studied the *Jenaer Liederhandschrift* and published excerpts from it.[65] In 1758 and 1759, with the financial aid of the city of Zürich, Bodmer and Breitinger

64) H. F. Maszmann, *Partonopeus und Melior* (Berlin 1847).

65) *Ausführliche Nachricht von einigen alten teutschen poetischen Manuscripten aus dem dreyzehenden und vierzehenden Jahrhunderte* (Jena 1754).

published practically the entire Paris MS. under the title *Sammlung von Minnesingern aus dem schwäbischen Zeitpunkte.*

There can be no doubt that the gradual growth in popularity of the MHG lyric had a salutary effect upon contemporary literature. The Anacreontic mode which flourished in the sixties quickly lost ground and the "Bardengebrüll," which owed its existence to Klopstock, ceased. Hagedorn's lyrics began to show a decided influence of older German poetry. He was perhaps the first poet to regain the good taste and correctness of the older lyric, and his example found followers. Gleim frankly acknowledged his indebtedness in his two collections *Gedichte nach den Minnesingern* (Berlin 1773) and *Gedichte nach Walther von der Vogelweide* (Halberstadt 1779). The MHG lyric had passed again out of the hands of the scholars and had become the undisputed possession of the poets and their readers.

Meanwhile the indefatigable Bodmer had already turned his attention to other fields. In 1756 J. H. Obereit, a physician in Lindau, had called his attention to two Nibelungen manuscripts in the library at Hohenems.[66] At his request the librarian von Wocher sent one of these to Bodmer. This was the manuscript now designated as C and located at Donaueschingen. From this he copied the second part and published *Chriemhilden Rache und die Klage* (Zürich 1757), including in the edition also a few fragments of *Josaphat.*[67] Again the effect was not overwhelming. Fr. Nicolai wrote a rather cool review of the publication in *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften* II (1758), 430, and for the next twenty years practically

66) Cf. Joh. Krueger, *Der Entdecker der Nibelungen* (Frankfurt 1883).

67) Zürich MS c. 79c, later ed. by Franz Pfeiffer, *ZsfdA.* 1, 126-135.

no further notice was taken of this epic.[68] In 1779 Christoph Heinrich Myller asked Bodmer to assist in a complete edition of the *Nibelungen.* Bodmer asked the Hohenems library for the manuscript from which he had printed the second part, but it had been mislaid. Another manuscript, the one now designated as A, was sent to him and he copied the first part for Myller, who published it together with a reprint of Bodmer's *Rache und Klage,* in the firm belief that the two parts belonged together. This error on the part of Myller caused endless confusion to the scholars of the subsequent generation.

Even Myller's efforts did not succed in establishing the *Nibelungenlied* in the good graces of his contemporaries. Johann Christoph Adelung in a review said: "Von Seiten der Dichtung verdienen alle diese Überbleibsel nicht die mindeste Aufmerksamkeit."[69] The reply of Frederick the Great to Myller upon receipt of his *Nibelungen* is well known but it is sufficiently characteristic to deserve repetition: "Hochgelahrter, lieber getreuer. Ihr urtheilt, viel zu vortheilhafft, von denen Gedichten aus dem 12., 13. und 14. Seculo, deren Druck ihr befördert habet, und zur Bereicherung der Teutschen Sprache, so brauchbahr haltet. Meiner Einsicht nach, sind solche, nicht einen Schusz Pulver, werth; und verdienten nicht, aus dem Staube der Vergessenheit, gezogen zu werden. In Meiner Bücher-Sammlung wenigstens, würde Ich, dergleichen elendes Zeug, nicht dulten; sondern herausschmeissen. Das Mir davon eingesandte Exemplar mag dahero sein Schicksaal, in der dortigen groszen Bibliothec, abwarten. Viele Nachfrage

---

68) Cf. Th. Abeling, "Das Nibelungenlied" (= *Teutonia,* 7. Heft), Leipzig 1907.

69) *Magazin für die deutsche Sprache* II, 2 (1784), 148.

verspricht aber solchem nicht; Euer sonst gnädiger König Frch. Potsdam, d. 22. Februar 1784."[70]

The prediction contained in the last sentence of the king's letter was not realized. Myller's book and the Berlin library in which it was to repose awaiting its fate, became the center of the great movement around which the study of the Middle Ages and the MHG epics and romances revolved. Ludwig Tieck, a native of Berlin, von der Hagen, Lachmann, Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm, all professors in the University of Berlin, carried on the work which Myller had begun.

The lion's share of credit for the revival of interest in the MHG monuments undoubtedly falls to Bodmer and his circle. But there were a few instances of reprints of epics and romances that were not directly inspired by him. The earliest of these was an edition of the late MHG poem *Dietrich und seine Gesellen*[71] and preceded by two years even Bodmer's first announcement of the Minnesingers. The publication of the very important autobiography of Emperor Maximilan I[72] falls in the seventies. This prose tale which Maximilian dictated to his secretaries and which Treitzsauerwein arranged, had never been previously printed. Its appearance caused a good deal of scholarly comment[73] and it was not lost sight of again. In 1777 the first popular translation of the *Edda*[74] appeared. Before the appearance of the *Nibelungenlied* there could scarcely be any interest in the old Norse myths. Of course there had been numerous vague references to Germanic antiquity for at least three

---

70) A. Höfer, *Die deutsche Philologie*, p. 7.

71) J. F. Christ, *Villaticum* (Leipzig 1746) 232 ff.

72) Marx Treitzsauerwein, *Weiszkunig* (Wien 1775).

73) The first of these comments is K. Renatus Hausen, *De claro libro der Weisz Kunig* (Frankfurt 1776).

74) *Die isländische Edda* übersetzt von Schimmelmann (Stettin 1777).

decades before Myller's *Nibelungen.* Klopstock had written the ode *Hermann und Thusnelda* (1752) and remained faithful to similar themes. Elias Schlegel sought his material in German and Norse mythology. Lessing, in his introduction to Gleim's *Preuszische Kriegslieder eines Grenadiers* (1758), speaks with a familiarity that tends to arouse suspicion of "die Gedichte der nordischen Skalden" and even Wieland became interested in Hermann as early as 1751. But the knowledge of all these writers of Germanic antiquity is not particularly convincing; it appears to be founded largely on hearsay. But Myller's *Nibelungenlied* and Schimmelmann's *Edda* brought the sources within easy reach, and first-hand knowledge of the old myths became more general.

In 1779 and 1780 Bodmer once more published a number of minor monuments,[75] this time going back to early MHG and into Anglo-Saxon literature. The same years brought an edition of Rudolf von Ems' *Weltchronik*[76] whose appeal was probably due to its character as biblical history rather than to its inherent value as a monument of the Middle Ages. At the same time J. W. C. G. Casparson announced an edition of Wolfram's *Willehalm*[77] and in the following year the entire poem, including the second part *(der starke Rennewart)* by Ulrich von Türheim, appeared in print.[78] In 1794 Bodmer republished Willehalm. There is something in the nature of a triumphant gesture about his publication of this work, which fifty years earlier he had deplored as lost forever.

---

75) *Literarische Denkmale von verschiendenen Verfassern* (Zürich 1779) and *Altenglische und altschwäbische Balladen* (ibid. 1780).

76) Ed. by Gottfried Schütze (Hamburg 1779-1781) II.

77) *Ankündigung eines deutschen epischen Gedichtes der altschwäbischen Zeit: Wilhelm der Heilige* (Cassel 1780).

78) *Wilhelm der Heilige von Oranse* (Kassel 1781-1784) II.

Even the *Waltharilied* experienced early efforts of popularization. In 1780 F. C. J. Fischer published 1337 lines of the poem[79] in the Latin original and two years later Fr. Molter translated the entire poem.[80] The Attila-background helped to make it a popular favorite. Although Myller had printed Hartmann's *Iwein* in his large collection, there was still room for a translation into modern German. This was made in 1787[81] and took its place beside the popular prose work *Der Ritter mit dem Leuen.* Another *Volksbuch* presently found itself with a competitor in the form of the poetic original, namely *Salomon und Morolf.*[82] In the next few years, of course, practically all *Volksbücher,* as shown above, were to share this fate. Two collections of minor monuments, finally, complete the list of MHG republications before 1800: Paul Jakob Bruns, *Romantische und andere Gedichte in altplattdeutscher Sprache* (Berlin 1798) and J. J. Eschenburg, *Denkmäler altdeutscher Dichtkunst* (Bremen 1799). The former contains chiefly historical poems found in manuscripts in the library at Helmstädt. The latter consists of excerpts and comments on *Wigamur, Engelhart und Engeldrut, Wilhelm von Narbone* and other poems.

We have already seen how the Volksbücher and their material influenced the writers of the eighteenth century and how Bodmer's publication of the *Pariser Liederhandschrift* produced an echo in the lyric poetry of the period. In a similarly striking manner the chivalric literature that was being revived by Bodmer and others, brought about an entirely new trend in contemporary writing.

---

79) *De prima expeditione Attilae* (Leipzig 1780).

80) *Walther, Prinz von Aquitanien* (Karlsruhe 1782).

81) K. J. Michaeler, *Iwein, ein Heldengedicht* (Wien 1787) II.

82) Aug. Schumann, *Salomo der Weise und sein Narr Markulph* (Jerusalem 1797).

There can be little doubt that the *Ritterdrama* and the *Ritterroman,* which enjoyed a period of unusual popularity in the seventies, are not traceable to English influence alone, but were influenced in equal measure by the new-found interest in the German Middle Ages.

In 1737 Wilhelm Friedrich von Pistorius published a biography of Götz von Berlichingen.[83] At the time the interest in the Middle Ages had not been generally awakened. In 1770, however, the soil had been prepared and Goethe eagerly seized the Götz material. A year later, when his drama appeared, the MHG movement was already at its height. Bürger, Vosz, Miller and Hölty were writing *Minnelieder* in conscious imitation of the MHG writers. Gleim composed *Gedichte nach den Minnesingern.* Friedrich von Stolberg's *Der schwäbische Ritter an seinen Sohn* had already appeared. Herder was finding the realization of his aesthetic ideals in the Middle Ages. Johannes von Müller was lecturing in a sympathetic vein on mediaeval history. The age of knighthood was experiencing a literary renaissance.

Lessing's *Emilia Galotti* had appeared just a short while before *Götz.* From a technical point of view the two dramas represented the extremes of the Greeks and Shakspeare, respectively. Lessing had on his side the entire weight of tradition and the support of the established school. Behind Goethe stood the new-found enthusiasm for the Middle Ages. For a time the two dramas stood side by side, on an equal footing and with equal influence. But the scale finally inclined in favor of *Götz;* the drama of knighthood became popular, Shakspeare became the model. In 1775 Pistorius' biography of Götz was reprinted, undoubtedly because the public de-

---

83) *Lebensbeschreibung von Götz von Berlichingen zubenannt mit der eisernen Hand* (Nürnberg 1737).

manded to know more of the hero of Goethe's drama. Lenz, Klinger and Wagner eagerly seized upon the material which the study of the Middle Ages was making available. Friedrich (Maler) Müller wrote about Faust and Genoveva. Törring's *Agnes Bernauerin* (1780) introduced the chivalric drama into Bavaria.

For a number of years Wieland had been resisting the new movement. Gradually he had been losing contact with the changing times and Goethe forced him, by means of the farce *Götter, Helden und Wieland,* to declare his position. With the utmost skill and tact Wieland abandoned his aloofness and plunged into the main current. In 1764 he had ridiculed the older phantastic material in his *Don Sylvio.* Now he became seriously interested in just such themes. His genius reached its greatest heights in the treatment of Arthurian legends, particularly in *Geron der Adelich.* Finally in his *Oberon,* culled from the old romances, he placed himself in the foremost rank of those who sought their themes in the Middle Ages.

If the popularity of the *Ritterdrama* and *Ritteroman* in the upper literary strata was great, it assumed alarming proportions in the lower levels. The reading public was swamped with literature of this sort; the situation began to resemble the dilemma of Goethe's *Zauberlehrling.* Soon the material furnished by mediaeval Germany became insufficient and the writers began to seek French and particularly English sources.[84] But the great writers had already extended their field of interest in other directions and, without them, the movement gradually lost momentum. In the nineties Schröder and Iffland devoted

---

84) Cf. Otto Brahm, *Das deutsche Ritterdrama des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1880). Kayser *Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis* under the sections "Romane" and "Schauspiele."

their efforts to the social drama and took their themes largely from middle-class life. Their writings enjoyed a passing favor with the general public, sufficient to put a stop to the flood of chivalric literature that had followed in the wake of *Götz*. The respite from chivalric literature was only brief, however, for immediately after the beginning of the new century the Romanticists returned to this material with renewed vigor. Their activities are too well known to require discussion. They not only republished most of the works that had been previously printed, but also brought out much material that had not yet appeared. It is clear, however, in the light of the evidence presented here, that whatever they did was neither new nor unprecedented, that the previous half century had witnessed remarkable activity in the field of MHG literature, that most of the important monuments had already been printed and that both the contemporary writers and their readers were quite familiar with the chivalric and mythical material.

III. Spiritual and Theological Literature.

The various types of spiritual and theological literature, of course, follow entirely different lines of tradition from any type of secular writing. It is quite conceivable, for example, that the works of Martin Luther should enjoy continued popular approval entirely outside of the main channel of literature, just as they remained the subject of constant research, regardless of the special antiquarian interests of any period. It is equally conceivable that some of the more extreme mystic lyrics of Friedrich von Spee should drop into oblivion for an entire century, only to be revived in a generation that found delight in the symbolism of a highly emotional religion. To the student of literature there is little profit in tracing the popular interest in Martin Luther and his writ-

ing; such interest is fairly constant and is not affected to any noticeable extent by the current literary concepts. The same thing is true of all writings that have become part of the dogma or ritual of any of the established churches. Dogmatic, controversial and homiletic literature is included here, along with spiritual lyrics and particularly hymns, Prätorius, Franck, Gerhardt, Neander and a great host of writers of hymns were constantly in the eyes and mouths of the general public without exerting any particular influence upon current writing or upon the philosophy of any period. These more obvious objects of tradition will therefore not be treated in this discussion.

A very interesting field for speculation is opened by the record of revivals in the eighteenth century of earlier mystic writers. Each of the several early schools of mysticism enjoyed a certain limited and sometimes local popularity, only to become extinct soon after the death of its founder and principal adherents. A revival of interest, however, in the teachings of each of these schools occurred at various times in the eighteenth century, in keeping with the several philosophical creeds of the period.

In his discussion of Jakob Bőhme and his writings, Goedeke[85] says: "Nach seinem am 16. Nov. 1624 erfolgten Tode gewann seine Lehre groszen Einflusz in Schlesien, wurde dann vergessen und erst von den Romantikern wieder hervorgezogen." This statement is entirely misleading. It is true, of course, that Böhme's teachings lost all influence soon after his death and were even forgotten. But the revival of interest in him took place long before the beginning of the Romantic period. In 1707 an isolated biographical treatment[86] of Böhme

85) 2III, 30.

86) J. A. Kahl, *De vita Jak. Böhmii* (Wittenberg 1707).

was published which, according to indications, was prompted by antiquarian interest and has no bearing on his dogma. At about the same time a number of his works were republished in Holland,[87] evidently by a local group of theosophists. The great revival of interest in Jakob Böhme occurred after 1779. This is the period of the Herrnhut Pietism. For several years this group had been growing and gaining in influence. Their creed was founded upon the same undeveloped pantheism and vague mysticism that had inspired Böhme. It was only natural, therefore, that a new interest in his writings became manifest and a number of them were reprinted.[88] This pietistic interest carried Bőhme along with it for a number of years, at least well into the Romantic period and whatever the Romanticists may have done for him was already fairly begun.

The same pietist movement was responsible for the revival, on a somewhat smaller scale, of Johannes Tauler. His mysticism was of an entirely different nature from Böhme's: it was not a bemused, retiring monasticism, but a healthy, aggressive religion. Moreover Tauler was an interesting and effective preacher. His sermons were printed as early as 1498 and were reprinted again and again until 1703. In 1787 extracts from his writings were published,[89] probably in opposition to the pietists

87) Gichtel, *Jak. Böhmes Schriften* (Amsterdam 1682, 1698, 1715, 1718, 1720).

88) *Letzte Posaune* (Berlin 1779); *Von der Wiedergeburt des Menschen* (ibid. 1779); *Aurora oder die Morgenröte im Aufgang* (ibid. 1780); *Abdolomino, Antworten auf 177 theosophische Fragen in Jakob Böhm* (Leipzig 1785); B. Heidecke, *J. Böhmens Schattenrisz mit Nachtrag* (Riga 1788); *Kurzer Auszug der allermerkwürdigsten Stellen aus den Schriften Jakob Böhmens* (Basel 1800); *Jak. Böhme, ein biographischer Versuch* (Pirna 1801); *Auszug aus Jak. Böhmens Schriften* (Frankfurt 1801); *Jak. Böhme, ein biographischer Versuch* (Dresden 1804).

89) *Erbauliche Auszüge aus dem Leben und Schriften Johannes Tauler's, eines Dominicaners* (Frankfurt 1787).

and Böhme. This edition represents the only revival of Tauler's teaching and even the Romanticists showed little interest in him; his mysticism was not sufficiently emotional for them.

The case of Friedrich von Spee is somewhat different. His collection of spiritual lyrics, *Trutznachtigall,* was printed six times, from the first edition in 1649 until 1709. His *Güldnes Tugendbuch* only had three editions until 1688. Neither of these works aroused any interest in the latter half of the eighteenth century, but the Romanticists displayed a great deal of activity on his behalf. The first edition of his works is J. H. von Wessenberg, *Fr. Spees Auserlesene Gedichte* (Zürich 1802) and a number of reprints followed. The neglect of his poetic works before 1800 does not mean that he had been forgotten. On the contrary, he was well known and much discussed, but the interest that was displayed was not in his lyrics but in his *Cautio Criminalis,* the famous polemic against witchcraft persecutions. This work, published originally in Latin but soon translated into German, French and Dutch, was reprinted many times in the seventeenth century. In 1703 it was incorporated into Johann Reich, *Schriften vom Unfug des Hexenprozesses,* a book which remained popular throughout the eighteenth century. The interest manifested in Spee before 1800 was almost entirely due to this book, to his connection with witchcraft and the stand which he took against witch persecution. To these factors he owed a number of biographical treatments after 1785.[90]

---

90) Cf. *Journal von und für Deutschland* (1785) No. 2; *Neue allg. deutsche Bibliothek* 81, 89 ff.; Eichhoff, *Material zur Statistik des niedersächs und westfäl, Kreises* 5, 485 ff.; Oberthür, *Taschenbuch für Geschichte etc. Frankenlandes* (1796), 45 ff.; *Würzburger wöchentl. Anzeigen von gelehrten Gegenständen* (1797), 301 and 420.

Johannes Geiler von Kaisersberg was the subject of almost uninterrupted scholarly and theological discussion throughout the eighteenth century, but very little popular interest in his works was shown. His connection with the Humanists is responsible for learned treatments by Riegger, Vierling, Oberlin and others and his disputed character as a forerunner of the Reformation kept him in the limelight of theological interest.[91] Only one collection of extracts from his works was published for popular consumption and even this does not bear his name.[92]

By far the most popular didactic writer, judging from the number of republications after 1750, was Abraham a Sancta Clara. Of course he was of comparatively recent memory (d. 1709) and some of his works were printed for the first time as late as 1733. But the real reason for the lasting popularity of his sermons is their simple, straightforward and somewhat coarse style. Their content is not extraordinary but rather commonplace. They are embellished, however, by fables, anecdotes and plain, terse illustrations from daily life and they became the equivalent in didactic literature of the *Volksbuch* in fiction. Their progress northward from Vienna is quite noticeable. The earlier editions all center in Austria and Bavaria, but by 1800 a number of his works were reprinted in northern cities.[93]

---

91) Cf. Heinr. Pantaleon, *Teutscher Nation Heldenbuch* II, 578; also *Deutscher Merkur* 4 (1783), 126.

92) *Geistreicher Granatapfel* etc. (Sulzbach 1789).

93) *Judas der Erzschelm für ehrliche Leute* (Augsburg 1752) IV; *Narrennest* (Wien 1753) III; *Reim dich oder ich lies dich* (Augsburg 1754); *Narrennest* (Wien 1757) II; *Geistliche Tugendschule* (Augsburg 1765); *Mercurialis oder Wintergrün* (Augsburg 1766); *Etwas für Alle* (Halle 1785); *Quintessenz aus Abraham a Sancta Claras Werken* (Leipzig 1795-1798); *Auserlesene Gedanken, Anekdoten etc. aus den Schriften des Paters Abraham a Sancta Clara* (Leipzig no date) III; *Centifolium Stultorum* (Nürnberg no date) II; *Gack-gack* (München no date); *Die vergrösserte Weiberschule* (Cöln no date).

IV. Meistergesang, Fables and Satiric Writing

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the Meistersänger had passed almost entirely out of the possession of the reading public and had become the property of the scholars. The Sprachgesellschaften had adopted them, particularly Hans Sachs, had made them part of their articles of faith, but took no steps to popularize them. The last edition of Hans Sachs was printed at Augsburg in 1712. It did not serve to restore the popularity of the old Meistersänger. A comic epic poem entitled *Hans Sachs ein Heldengedicht*, written in 1702 by Christian Wernicke (1661-1725), blackened the memory and destroyed the credit of Sachs for more than half a century. This poem was a polemic against Christian Heinrich Postel; in it Hans Sachs is represented as the ruler in the kingdom of ignorance and Postel—the name disguised as "Stelpo"—is his heir and successor. The perverted taste of Wernicke is largely responsible for the disdain with which the first half of the eighteenth century looked upon Hans Sachs.

Gottsched, of course, as a true child of his time, saw in Hans Sachs only the type of a thoroughly disgusting poetaster. As a conscientious historian he could not omit his works from *Nöthiger Vorrat* and *Schaubühne* but he treated them with contempt. It is more difficult to understand Bodmer's position. In 1742 he reprinted Wernicke's *Heldengedicht*[94] with footnotes and an explanatory essay, but he did not find it necessary to defend the literary reputation of Hans Sachs. The Postel-Wernicke controversy is treated in an entirely impersonal and uncritical manner and the bearing of the poem on Hans Sachs and his works is not touched at all.

---

94) In *Sammlung Critischer, Poetischer und anderer geistvollen Schriften*, Erstes Stück, 115-137.

A very interesting comment by Wernicke throws a light upon the acquaintance of the reading public with Hans Sachs. He says at the beginning of his "Dunkle Erklärungen dieses Heldengedichts": "Wo es dem Leser nicht allbereit bekannt ist, so wird him ihm hiemit zu wissen gethan, dasz Hans Sachs ein berühmter Schuster und Pritschmeister in Deutschland gewesen, welcher mit Verwunderung nicht allein Schuhe, sondern auch Füsse zu machen gewuszt." This comment, which Bodmer takes over into his edition of the poem, shows that it was necessary to identify Hans Sachs to the reader. Wernicke's low opinion of the great Meistersänger is clearly shown in an English quatrain of his own manufacture which he attributes to a fictitious "Sir Thomas Cuckold":

> John Sachs a German, was a devilish fellow,
> Whose fists all o'er of pitch and Ink were yellow;
> Who with his shoes made the feet sore,
> But with his Rhymes the head much more.

If Bodmer had a favorable opinion of Hans Sachs, he might be expected to comment on these lines of Wernicke's. If someone had expressed such an opinion regarding the Minnesingers, we may be certain that Bodmer either would not have reprinted it at all or would have added a lengthy and indignant footnote. To all appearances, then, the younger Bodmer was quite unconcerned about the Meistersänger. In his later years his attitude might have changed, but he was so wrapped up in Minnesang, heroic epics and romances that he failed to find time for this later form of literature.

It remained for the rationalists to restore Meistergesang to favor. In 1765 Salomon Ranisch published a biography of Hans Sachs. Abraham Gotthelf Kästner calls himself "ein fleisziger Leser des alten Meistersängers" and comments appreciatively on his style.[95]

95) *Poetische und Prosaische Schönwissenschaftliche Werke* (Berlin 1841) II, 134-135.

Der Bauer in der Hölle was reprinted in *Sammlung einiger Comoedien* (Frankfurt 1770) and brought Hans Sachs again into the public eye. But the chief credit for the restoration of Hans Sachs goes to Goethe. In *Dichtung und Wahrheit*[96] he pays part of the debt which he owes to the great Meistersänger: "Hans Sachs, der wirklich meisterliche Dichter lag uns am nächsten. Ein wahres Talent, freilich nicht wie jene Ritter und Hofmänner, sondern ein schlichter Bürger, wie wir uns auch zu sein rühmten. Ein didaktischer Realism sagte uns zu, und wir benutzten den leichten Rhythmus, den sich willig anbietenden Reim, bei manchen Gelegenheiten. Es schien dieser Art so bequem zur Poesie des Tages, und deren bedurften wir jede Stunde." Goethe drew freely upon Hans Sachs' wealth of material, upon the picturesqueness of his language, upon his easy command of rhyme and rhythm. *Pater Brey, Jahrmarktfest zu Plundersweilern, Satyros,* the rhymed couplets in *Urfaust,* several motifs in *Faust I* (Martha) and *II* (Kaiserpfalz), the entire concept of Ahasver in *Der Ewige Jude,* all these bear evidence of the influence of Hans Sachs on Goethe. The poet's admiration of the old master is best summarized in the closing lines of his poem *Hans Sachsens poetische Sendung:*

> Den Eichkranz, ewig jung belaubt,
> Den setzt die Nachwelt ihm aufs Haupt,
> In Froschpfuhl all das Volk verbannt,
> Das seinen Meister je verkannt.

It was Goethe who converted Wieland to an understanding of Hans Sachs and an appreciation of the popular humorous literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. And it was Wieland who, by means of portraits and biographical sketches in his *Deutscher Mercur* promoted popular interest in Hans Sachs, Sebastian Brant, Geiler von Kaiserberg and others. This popular interest

96) *Werke* (Weimar) 25, 59 f.

led to new editions of their works and comment in various journals.[97]

Thomas Murner seems not to have dropped completely out of popular consciousness at any time. An extract of his *De phitonico contractu* was published in E. D. Hauber's *Bibliotheca Magica* (Lemgo 1739) 1, 116-121. The nature of the extract shows that it was Murner's interest in the supernatural that kept him popular long after his contemporaries had dropped out of sight. That he was a well known figure to the writers as well as to the reading public is shown by F. W. Zachariä's comic epic *Murner in der Hölle* (Rostock 1757, repr. 1767). A little later *Die Mühle von Schwyndelzheym* was reprinted by J. G. Weller in *Altes und Neues aus allen Theilen der Geschichte* and in 1788 G. E. Waldau reprinted *Schelmenzunft,* which had had an almost continuous tradition down to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The German fable of the eighteenth century boasts an ancient and honorable lineage. It is not entirely a matter of chance that Hagedorn and Haller, Gellert and Lessing showed a strong and constant devotion to this form of writing. Of course Lafontaine and Lamotte and through them Aesop and Phaedrus exerted an influence on the German fabulists, but the latter also knew and

---

97) F. J. Bertuch, *Proben aus des alten Meistersängers Hans Sachsens Werken* (Weimar 1778); J. H. Häslein, *Hans Sachsens sehr herrliche, schöne und wahrhafte Gedichte, Fabeln und gute Schwenk* (Nürnberg 1781); G. W. R. Becker, *Späne aus der Werkstatt Meister Hans Saxens* (Leipzig 1793); H. G. v. Bretschneider, *Ankündigung und Probe einer neuen Ausgabe von Fischarts Übersetzung des Rabelais* (Nürnberg 1775); C. F. I. Schorch, *Tenglers Layenspiegel* (Erfurt 1796); Leonh. Meister, "Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff," *Beyträge zur Geschichte der teutschen Sprache und Literatur* (London 1777), 1, 252 ff.; also in *Charackteristiken teutscher Dichter* (Zürich 1785), 1, 360 ff.

freely imitated their domestic predecessors. Erasmus Alberus and his fables enjoyed an uninterrupted tradition through the centuries and furnished models for the later writers.[98] Hagedorn, fortunately for the student, furnished his fables with footnotes referring to his sources. Along with their classic antecedents he names here Erasmus Alberus, Burchard Waldis and Hartmann Schopper. Friedrich Wilhelm Zachariä was so thoroughly conscious of his source that he entitled his collection *Fabeln und Erzählungen in Burcard Waldis' Manier* (Braunschweig 1771, repr. 1777).

One of the most interesting episodes connected with the fable grew out of Bodmer's publication of *Fabeln aus den Zeiten der Minnesinger* (Zürich 1757). He believed that this collection had not been previously printed, although he was aware that Joh. Georg Scherz had published fifty-one of these fables as academic dissertations at Straszburg between 1704 and 1710. Both Scherz and Bodmer were ignorant of the authorship of these fables and made no speculations as to their origin. Gottsched, however, believed that he had discovered a Burggraf von Riedenburg[99] as author of these fables and published an article [100] to that effect. Lessing then became interested in the question and in two brilliant articles [101] not only disproved Gottsched's theory but definitely established that the fables were the work of Ulrich Boner. From this time dates the popularity of *Der Edelstein*.

98) J. C. Olearius, *Gesang D. Erasmi Alberi* (Arnstadt 1720); Salig in *Historie der Augspurger Confession* (1735) 3, 40; J. J. Körber, *Beyträge zu der Lebensbeschreibung Erasmi Alberi* (Hanau 1751).

99) Burggraf von Rietenburg, probably identical with Burggraf von Regensburg (d. ca. 1176), was a Minnesinger of minor importance. Cf. Hagen's *Minnesinger* 1, 171; 4, 480-484.

100) In *Das Neueste aus der anmuthigen Gelehrsamkeit* 6 (1756), 424 ff.

101) Cf. *Werke* (Lachmann-Muncker) 11, 322-351; 14, 3-33.

The animal epic, a form closely related to the fable, also remained a constant popular favorite. *Reineke Vos* had been converted into a *Volksbuch* at a fairly early early time and in this form it remained accessible far into the eighteenth century. Gottsched's[102] interest in it was chiefly antiquarian but it served to attract attention in widespread circles to the poetic original. In 1783 L. Suhl translated one of the other numerous versions of the poem,[103] in 1792 Gottsched's edition was reprinted and in 1794 Goethe published his free translation. Two more editions [104] before the beginning of the Romantic period show its continued popularity. Georg Rollenhagen's *Froschmeuseler* also remained a favorite far into the eighteenth century.[105] Then, after a lapse of some years, it was again brought before the public in several editions, the best of which is the elaboration by G. Lappe, *Der neue Froschmeuseler* (Köln 1796). In connection with Rollenhagen it may not be out of place to mention his contemporary, Bartolomäus Ringwalt, even though his specialty did not lie in the field of the animal epic. Ringwalt's *Treuer Eckart* was reprinted as late as 1738 in competition with the *Volksbuch* of the same name and the theme passed into art literature in Sturm und Drang. His *Epithalamium* was reprinted in 1797, for no apparent reason, and left no impression on contemporary literature.

The satirists, finally, deserve some attention, particularly since the influence of the earlier centuries is clearly

---

102) J. C. Gottsched, *Reineke de Vos nach der Ausgabe von 1498 übersetzt* (Leipzig 1752).

103) *Die Historie von Reynaert de Vos, nach der Delfter Ausgabe von 1485* (Lübeck 1783).

104) G. G. Bredow, *Reinke de Vos, met eener Verklaaring der olden sassische Worde* (Eutin 1798); D. W. Soltau, *Reineke de Vos* (Berlin 1803).

105) Last printed in Frankfurt 1730 and Berlin 1731.

seen in this form of writing. The epigrammatists of the middle of the eighteenth century, Hagedorn, Ramler, Liscow, Rabener, Kästner, Lessing, were all scholars and students of older literature insofar as it touched upon their field of interest. They were thoroughly acquainted with their predecessors, Rachel, Lauremberg, Canitz, Neukirch; Lessing even made use of such an obscure writer as Euricius Cordus. But the works of the older satirists were not accessible to the writers and scholars alone. Joachim Rachel's verses, for example, were printed as a fifth edition in 1742 and his collected works were republished a year later.[106] The revival of Logau, on the other hand, was largely due to the research activities of Lessing. In collaboration with Ramler he published this brilliant writer's epigrams[107] and Ramler alone prepared a second edition in 1791. Incidentally an oversight on the part of Lessing shows that even the most brilliant bibliographer is not infallible. In the Introduction to his edition of Logau Lessing says: "Ein ganzes Jahrhundert, und drüber, haben sich die Liebhaber mit einer einzigen Auflage dieses Dichters beholfen." He was evidently unaware of the edition S. v. G. *Auferweckte Gedichte* (Frankfurt u. Leipzig 1702).

V. The Seventeenth Century.

The connecting links between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are so obvious and so well known[108] that a full discussion here seems unnecessary. The most important influence, for better or for worse, is exerted by Martin Opitz. The varying attitude toward this "fa-

106) J. J. Wippel, *Joachim Rachel's satyrische Gedichte* (Berlin 1743).

107) Cf. Lessing, *Werke* (Lachmann-Muncker) 7, 125-411.

108) Cf. F. J. Schneider, *Die deutsche Dichtung zwischen Barock und Klassizismus* (Stuttgart 1924).

ther of modern German poetry" of the eighteenth century writers could be made the subject of an interesting and profitable study. The Rationalists, of course, might be expected to praise and admire him, Bodmer and his circle, on the other hand, to regard him at least with suspicion. This is not the case, however. The question of Opitz is one of the few subjects on which Gottsched and Bodmer were in agreement. Bodmer and Breitinger not only attempted an edition of Opitz' works but also published a collection of poems in praise of the Silesian bard. With the coming of Sturm und Drang his reputation began to totter and to the Romanticists he was anathema. But throughout the entire century his works were frequently reprinted and discussed.[109]

The influence of the seventeenth-century novelists was felt far down into the Rationalistic age. Since the first half of the eighteenth century produced no novelist of consequence, it is not surprising that the books of the preceding decades were reprinted and read. Along with the *Volksbücher* they probably formed the chief literary amusement of the ordinary reader. Grimmelshausen's *Simplicissimus*, for example, was reprinted in 1701, 1705 and 1713. A new edition appeared in 1756 and its chief episodes were republished in 1758. The latter half of the century revived the interest in travel stories and produced an elaboration of the novel in 1790. In the

---

109) D. W. Triller, *Martin Opizen Teutsche Gedichte* (Frankfurt 1736-1746) IV; Anon. (Bodmer), *Der gemisshandelte Opitz in der Trillerschen Ausfertigung seiner Gedichte* (Zürich 1747); K. G Lindnern, *Umständliche Nachricht von des weltberühmten Schlesiers, Martin Opitz von Boberfeld, Leben, Tode und Schriften* (Hirschberg 1740-1741) II; J. J. Bodmer und J. J. Breitinger, *Martin Opitzens von Boberfeld Gedichte* (Zürich 1745) I, only; *Martin Opitzens von Boberfeld Lobgedichte* (Zürich 1755); F. W. Zachariä, *Auserlesene Stücke der besten deutschen*, Dichter, I. Bd. (Braunschweig 1766); S. G. Lange, *Einer Gesellschaft auf dem Lande poetische, moralische, ökonomische und kritische Beschäftigung* (Halle 1777).

following year a modernization of the story appeared. All the other works of Grimmelshausen, however, disappeared after 1680. Zigler-Kliphausen's *Asiatische Banise* appears to have remained popular for a long time. It was reprinted in 1728, 1738, 1753 and 1766. Stronger evidence of its popularity is presented by the numerous imitations: *Die deutsche Banise* (1752), *Die engelländische Banise* (1754), *Psammitichus* (1759) and others. Christian Reuter's *Schelmuffsky* was reprinted in 1750 and later enjoyed popularity with editions in 1818 and 1821. August Bohse's *Tausend und eine Nacht* was printed as late as 1759 and *Tausend und ein Tag* until 1762. It is quite evident that these books took their places in the lower levels of literature along with the *Volksbücher* and that even the splendid products of the Golden Age of German writing were unable to displace them with a certain class of readers.

The dramatic and poetic literature of the seventeenth century was not as long preserved or as influential. The last recorded presentation of Gryphius' *Herr Peter Squentz*[110] was in Annaberg in 1722. His other works had dropped out of sight long ago. Hofmann von Hofmannswaldau's poems were reprinted twenty-one times between 1681 and 1737 and then disappeared before Gottsched's withering scorn.[111] Lohenstein's poems, particularly his *Arminius und Thusnelda*, lasted about as long and were lost in oblivion at about the same time. Of the Königsberg poets Simon Dach probably remained alive in the popular consciousness for the longest time. He enjoyed the distinction of contributing several gems to Germany's folk songs. On the centenary of Dach's death, J. F. Lauson published a memorial *Das lorbeer-*

---

110) Cf. Gottsched's *Beyträge* 8, 483.

111) Cf. *Beyträge* 1, 496-526.

würdige Andenken eines Dichters, M. Simon Dach (Königsberg 1759) and later a number of his poems were reprinted in Baczko's *Preussische Annalen* I (1792), 1, 118-127; 2, 127-129.

These few examples have shown that the eighteenth century was by no means ignorant of its immediate predecessors. It was probably justified in neglecting them, for, with few exceptions, the products of the seventeenth century deserve their oblivion. It might also be pointed out that the Romanticists, who were ordinarily not very discriminating in their interest in older German literature, were extremely reluctant to take the writers of the seventeenth century to their bosoms. In fact, very little interest in this period was shown before Wilhelm Müller's *Bibliothek der deutschen Dichter des 17.. Jahrhunderts* (1822-1827).

INDEX

Page No.

Abel 34
Abeling 55
Abraham a Sancta Clara 65
Adelung, Fr. v.....25, 36
Adelung, J. C....21, 29, 55
Aesop 38, 69
Alberus.....36, 38, 70
Anderson 33
Aretin 34, 35
Arnim 7, 35, 51
Arnoldt 20, 21, 26
Ayrer 39

Babo 29
Babrias 38
Baczko 75
Batt 29
Bauer 24
Bayer 20
Becker 69
Benecke 29
Benz 47
Bertuch 69
Birlinger 8, 9, 11
Bobertag..... 47
Bodmer 12, 14, 24, 28, 35, 36, 39, 41, 45, 49, 52-58, 66, 67, 70, 73.
Böhme 62- 64
Bohse 74
Boner, ...19, 36, 38, 70
Borinski 9, 11
Boxhorn 16
Brahm 60
Brant 18, 68
Bredow 71
Breitinger 14, 28, 35, 49, 53, 54, 73
Brentano.....7, 35, 51
Bretschneider 69
Brucker 21

Page No.

Bruns.....25, 34, 58
Buchholtz 46
Bürger 59
Büsching..7, 10, 12, 29, 34
Burdach 30

Caedmon 17
Canitz 72
Casparson 57
Celtes 40
Christ 56
Conrad, Pfaffe..... 17
Conrad v. Würzburg 36, 52
Cordus 72
Crecelius.....8, 9, 11
Czepko 42

Dach 74, 75
Diecmann 19
Docen 7, 10, 35
Dreyer 38

Eccard 18
Eichendorff 10
Eichhoff 64
Eitenbenz 29
Eschenburg 29, 58

Faber 25
Fischer, F. C. J..... 58
Fischer, F. H..... 8
Flacius 16, 18
Foltz 39
Fouqué 7, 10, 51
Franck 36, 38, 62
Frederick the Great... 44, 45, 55, 56
Freher 16
Frick.....16, 19, 20
Fröhlich 41
Fulda 32, 33

Page No.

Gärtner 34
Gallati 34
Gasser 16
Gaszler 29
Geiler....17, 18, 24, 65, 68
Gellert...36, 38, 45, 46, 69
Gerhardt 40, 62
Gerstenberg 25
Gichtel 63
Gleim....15, 46, 54, 57, 59
Goedeke 20, 22, 23, 24, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 62.
Görres 7, 47
Goethe 9, 14, 37, 38, 45 46, 49, 50, 59, 60, 68, 71
Goldast.....16, 19, 52, 53
Gottsched 12-14, 24, 26-28, 35, 37-39, 41, 42, 44-46, 49, 66, 70, 71, 73, 74
Gottfried v. Straszburg 36
Gräter 29, 36
Grimm 7, 10, 12, 13, 35, 56
Grimmelshausen 46, 73, 74
Grupen, H..... 34
Grupen, C. U..... 34
Gryphius 74

Hadlaub 53
Häffelin 25
Hagedorn 36, 46, 49, 54, 69, 70, 72
Hagen 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 29, 31, 34, 56, 70
Haid 21
Haller 49, 69
Haltaus 32
Harsdörffer 42
Hartmann v. Aue..... 58
Häslein 69
Hauber 69
Hausen 56
Hegewisch 29

Page No.

Heidecke 63
Heine 11, 12
Heinze 42
Herder 9, 25, 39, 49, 50, 59
Hermann v. Sachsenheim 52
Höfer 56
Hölderlin 10
Hölty 59
Hofmannswaldau 74
Hrabanus Maurus..... 19
Hummel 24
Hutten 40, 41

Iffland 60
Isidor 17, 18

Jachmann 43
Jöcher 21, 22
Jördens 22
Julius 29

Kästner 67, 72
Kahl 62
Kleist 7, 10
Klinger 60
Klopstock 46. 54, 57
Klotz 31
Knorring 50
Koberstein 29
Koch 29. 30
Körber 70
Krueger 54
Küttner 29

Lachmann 12, 56
Lafontaine 69
Lambeck 16, 18
Lamotte 69
Lange 73
Lappe 71
Lauremberg 72
Lauson 74
Leibniz 18, 33

Page No.

Lenz 60
Lessing 26, 41-43, 46, 49, 57, 59, 69, 70, 72
Lilienthal 20
Lindnern 73
Lipsius 17
Liscow 72
Logau 43, 72
Lohenstein 74
Luther.....13, 40, 41, 61

Mackensen 47
Manesse 53
Maszmann 53
Mathesius 38
Meermann 34
Meisner 33, 42
Meister 69
Meusebach 7
Michaeler 58
Miller 59
Mohnicke 41
Molter 58
Mone 12, 29
Morhof 16, 19
Moscherosch 46
Müller, Fr. (Maler) 48, 60
Müller, J. J..... 39
Müller, Joh. v..... 59
Müller, Wilh..... 75
Murner 40, 69
Myller.....35, 36, 55- 58

Neander 62
Neuber 45
Neukirch 72
Nicolai 54
Notker 18

Obereit 54
Oberlin.....12, 32, 38, 65
Oberthür 64
Olearius 70
Opitz .....
13, 16, 37, 41, 42, 72, 73

Page No.

Otfrid 17, 18, 31

Palthen 18
Pantaleon 65
Panzer 25
Paul.....14, 20, 33, 35
Petrich 10
Pez, Bernhard.....19, 31
Pez, Hieronymus..... 34
Pfeffer 24
Pfeiffer 54
Phaedrus 38, 69
Philippi 37
Pistorius 59
Postel 66
Prasch 33
Prätorius 62

Rabener
36, 38, 45, 46, 49, 72
Rachel 72
Ramler.....43, 46, 49, 72
Ranisch 37, 67
Raumer 20, 27, 33, 35
Reich 64
Reichard 50
Reinmar v. Zweter.... 52
Reuchlin 40
Reuter 46, 74
Rhenanus 16
Rhode 20
Riederer 23
Riegger 23, 65
Rietenburg 70
Ringwalt 35, 38, 71
Rosenplüt 39
Rotermund 22
Rubeanus 40
Rudolf v. Ems..... 57

Sachs 37, 44, 66- 68
Saemund 30
Salig 70
Salomon 8, 9, 11

Page No.

Saxo 30, 31
Scheffler 42
Schelhorn 22, 23, 26
Scherz .....
12, 16, 18, 19, 31, 32, 70
Schilter .....
12, 16, 18-20, 30-33, 35, 52
Schimmelmann..31, 56, 57
Schlegel, A. W.....
7, 9, 35, 50
Schlegel, Dorothea.... 50
Schlegel, Elias..... 57
Schlegel, Friedrich....
7, 35, 50
Schneider 72
Schnurr 38
Schöber 31
Schöpflin 53
Scholtz 43
Schopper 38, 70
Schorch 69
Schottelius 16
Schröder 60
Schumann 58
Schütze 57
Schwindel 22, 23
Scotomius 22
Scultetus 42, 43
Seyler 20
Shakespeare 59
Simrock 35
Sincerus 22, 23, 37
Snorre 30
Soltau 71
Spee 61, 64
Stade 18, 32
Stolberg 59
Stolz 41
Stricker 17, 35
Suhl 71

Tauler 63, 64
Tieck .....
7, 9, 10, 11, 35, 39, 50, 56

Page No.

Törring 60
Treitzsauerwein 56
Triller 73

Uhland 7
Ulrich v. Türheim...52, 57

Vadianus 16
Vetterlein 29
Vierling 65
Volprecht 20
Vosz 59

Wachter 19, 32
Wackenroder 10, 11
Wagenseil 19, 22
Wagner, H. G. A..... 41
Wagner, H. L..... 60
Waldau 69
Waldis 38, 70
Walther v. d. Vogelweide
52, 54
Weber 29
Weckherlin 29
Weisse 36, 38
Weller 69
Wernaer 9- 11
Wernicke 66, 67
Wessenberg 64
Wiarda 34
Wickram, Conrad..... 24
Wickram, Peter..... 24
Wiedeburg 35, 53
Wieland 57, 60, 68
Williram 17, 31
Wimpheling 24, 40
Wippel 72
Wocher 54
Wolfram v. Eschenbach
52, 57

Zachariä .....
45, 48, 69, 70, 73
Zahn 33
Zesen 42, 46
Zigler-Kliphausen ..46, 74